DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 606 IR 005 789

AUTHOR Baatz, Wilmer H.
TITLE Collection Development in 19 Libraries of the Association of Research Libraries.
SPONS AGENCY Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 90p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Library Administration; Library Automation; *Library Collections; *Library Material Selection; Library Research; Microforms; *Research Libraries; *University Libraries; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS Association of Research Libraries

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to determine how large research libraries perform the function of collection development. The paper describes collection development theory within the formal organizational structure of the library, identifies the actual decision points involved in selection of materials, and examines the staff and facilities provided for collection development. Information was obtained through personal interviews of 300 librarians at 18 ARL (Association of Research Libraries) libraries throughout the U.S. Those interviewed included collection development officers, area and subject librarians, bibliographers, and curators. Findings are summarized in the following areas: allocation decisions, automation, approval plans and blanket orders, book funds, collection policies and committees, cooperation, elitism vs. no one cares, evaluation of collections, exchanges and gifts, faculty vs. librarians in selection, interlibrary loans, microforms, organization, preservation, reference, retrospective, serials, space and staff, teaching, technical services involvement, use studies, and weeding and storage. (Author/JAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153606

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN 19 LIBRARIES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

By Wilmer H. Baatz
Assistant Director for Collection Development
Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wilmer H. Baatz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A report resulting from a Fellowship of the Council on Library Resources and a Sabbatical Leave extended by Indiana University.

March 1978

+ 12000 789

STATEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES OF MY STUDY

In my application to the Council on Library Rescouces, I submitted the following concise statement of my proposed program:

Determine how large research libraries in the United States perform the function of collection development, including subject and area librarians, faculty, and also branch librarians. First, describe how large research libraries have organized the task of collection development in theory in their formal organization charts, including branch libraries. Second, identify the actual decision points involved in selection of library materials, whether or not these correspond to the organization charts. Finally, discover how large university libraries actually provide staff and facilities for collection development.

EXTENT THAT THE OBJECTIVES OF MY STUDY WERE REALIZED

I feel that the objectives were fully realized but it took some 300 interviews at 18 ARL libraries, not counting Indiana University, on the East Coast, West Coast, Texas, Big Ten and Chicago, to achieve this. This required travel over a four month's period of time, and only the generosity of the Council on Library Resources in granting me the Fellowship and Indiana University in granting me a Sabbatical Leave for five months at full pay made this possible. This report summarizes my findings to the problems outlined above in the objective of the study. The problems are divided into these areas: Allocation decisions; Automation; Approval plans and blanket orders; Book Funds; Collection Policies and committees; Cooperation; Elitism vs. No One Cares; Evaluation of collections; Exchanges and gifts; Faculty vs. Librarians in selection; Interlibrary Loans; Microforms; Organization; Preservation; Reference; Retrospective; Serials; Space and Staff (the priority needs); Teaching; Technical Services Involvement; Use Studies; and Weeding and Storage.

HOW THE STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT

I first visited the Office of Management Services, Associate of

Research Libraries, where I received the counsel and assistance of Duane Webster, Jeff Gardner, and Suzanne Frankie. They gave me the replies to their Collection Analysis Project Survey of April 1977 so that I was able to study the significant replies including those from the universities I planned to visit. Discussions with the three ARL staff proved also very valuable. Mr. Webster, very thoughtfully, gave me a copy of their Interview Guide--Draft 11/12/76, which I used throughout my project as a framework for my inquiry. I have furnished CRL a copy of my working notes as well as a copy of the talk I gave at Indiana State University on October 21, 1977, titled "Recent Changes and Current Status of Collection Development in Large Research Libraries." In return Mr. Webster sent me copies of the talks that he and Mr. Gardner gave to the ARL Membership Meeting. Both Mr. Webster and I gave verbal reports to the Midwinter Meeting of the Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group. I am Chairman of this Discussion Group. Coordination with the Office of Management Services, ARL has been excellent, and I appreciate their help.

LISTING OF ACTIVITIES AND PLACES VISITED

I visited 18 ARL libraries and interviewed 225 individuals, and an additional 75 persons in groups of two to ten, for a total of 300 individuals. Each interview averaged an hour, and the ARL Interview Guide was used as the skeleton framework for the interview. Of course, those librarians interviewed had varied interest, and I had to follow their bents to some extent. This tended to be more fruitful an approach than trying to stick too closely to the interview guide.

I started my Eastern tour, after my stop at ARL, by visiting Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and North Carolina with a stopover in Terre Haute for the Indiana State talk before my return to Bloomington. This trip lasted Oct. 2-21, 1977. At each library I interviewed from a minimum of 10 to

maximum of 26 people. My second trip, Oct. 30-Nov. 13,was to Minnesota, Iowa and Wisconsin. I drove to Columbus, Ohio, on Nov. 16th and returned late on the 18th. Then I left in the snows of Nov. 27th for my Midwest visits by auto to Michigan, Michigan State, Purdue, Illinois, Northwestern, and Chicago, in that order, returning to Bloomington on Dec. 16, 1977. My final trip was by air, leaving January 3, 1978, for Austin, Texas (University of Texas) and flying on to UCLA, Berkeley, and Stanford, stopping off to report to ALA Midwinter Collection Development Group at Chicago on Jan. 21, 1978, (at no expense to CLR), and returned to Bloomington on January 22, 1978.

As I am Chairman of the Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group and have been Chairman of the Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group, I am personally acquainted with many of the Directors, Associate Directors, or Assistant Directors of the 18 ARL libraries I visited. The directors of the libraries to be visited were written the reasons for my visit and the timing for it, and I had their written approval and cooperation when I arrived. I feel being a CLR Fellow tends to open the doors. I certainly received every cooperation and consideration possible. I am awed by the hospitality of my fellow librarians. I only hope I can reciprocate.

In some cases my time was well-scheduled before I arrived, in others they felt they wished to talk to me before solidifying my schedule, though they had alerted their staffs of my visit. The scheduling worked because everyone wanted it to. In most cases the Chief Collection Development Officer took charge of my scheduling. In five of the libraries, I first met with an Administrative Staff Group, the top administrators of the library system, who briefed me. Minnesota and Northwestern stand out in my mind for the excellence of their presentations by these groups. In the

others some one person, usually the Collection Development Officer, took me in charge and organized my schedule and literally guided me around the campus and the Main Library.

I had asked that I spend at least one full day visiting branch librarians in their libraries; I feel talking to them on their own turf is important, for you can get a much better feel of their problems if you eyeball them personally. I also tried to spend at least one day with the subject and area librarians, the bibliographers, curators and selectors in the Main Library. I often spent the major part of the third day with the Collection Development Officer or split it with other members of the top administration. In several cases I simply did not have enough time to do the kind of a job I'd like to have done. For example, I had no idea of the extent of Michigan State University campus. I also needed more time than I had at Ohio State. In none did I exhaust the possibilities for securing information that would have been helpful to the study.

I interviewed individual bibliographers and branch librarians an hour each, usually six or seven a day, making handwritten notes during the interview and typing them up in the evenings or on week-ends. I borrowed a most unique array of manual typewriters. The librarians were very trusting, giving me the master key to the Director's suite and such. I do not think I absconded with any thing of value! In over half of the visits, I had a wrap-up meeting with either the Director, the Administrative group, or the Collection Development Officer. I have also corresponded with some of the institutional representatives since my return in order to clear up some points I was uncertain about.

BENEFIT OF THE FELLOWSHIP TO MY CAREER PRESENT AND FUTURE

The knowledge of collection development practices certainly gives me a sense of proportion on my job that I could not have secured in any other way. The results point clearly to problem areas that should be pursued locally, such as use studies, continuing education regarding microforms, elitism, preservation, weeding and storage, evaluation of collections, cooperation, automation, and others. I was able to observe many efforts to solve these problems--with varying degrees of success. I feel I have a firmer base of knowledge for my own activities.

I am now regarded as a knowledgable specialist in Collection Development. Every university visited insisted that they wanted a copy of the final report. I have had some kind comments about my summary presentation about the report to the group at Midwinter. I suspect I will be asked to make other presentations of my findings. I feel strongly that this experience is a once-in-a-lifetime experience that few librarians are fortunate enough to have, and it can only help my career. I am most grateful for the opportunity.

CRITICAL EVALUATIVE STATEMENT

Each of my 22 subject areas needs more research. In two to three days at an institution, one can only skim the surface. However, I was very pleased to receive a letter from the Director of Libraries at Minnesota dated February 22, 1978, in which he said "In looking over your Minnesota notes, I am amazed at the amount of information you squeezed out within such a brief visit. I can identify no misunderstandings or errors of any consequence....We were very pleased to have you visit us. I hope that you found it informative and useful."

There is much interest in use studies largely because of the budget crunch. Most librarians are interested to learn what that 10% to 15% of

the titles comprise 80% to 90% of the total circulation. They wish to learn what can be cancelled without real harm to library service. They want to know what can be shifted to storage with a minimum outcry from clientele.

I was surprised to learn that space and personnel needs rank ahead of additional funds for materials as top needs in nearly all the libraries. This does not mean that they are not suffering from lack of materials funds, but that they are suffering more from shortages of the other two. Another serious problem is lack of funds for equipment, especially for microform equipment and space for microforms. There were some institutions with excellent audio-visual, or learning resource centers, and others with minimal equipment or interst. I did not look into this area in any depth.

Automation is accepted as the wave of the future but many feel it is not an unmixed blessing. They believe automation is rigid in its demands and that other parts of the library have suffered at least initially from automation's demands for funds and personnel and space. There are hopes that computers will pinpoint use of the collections to assist with problems of what to duplicate and what to send to storage or to weed. While network automation can furnish information on who holds what titles, it tends to make clientele somewhat more dissatisfied with local collection especially if the borrowers have to pay an Interlibrary Loan fee to such libraries as Harvard.

Unquestionably there has been a swing from the type of director whose major goal was research collection building to one who is more interested in service and who is at least conscious of the needs of the branches, though I feel that the latter are still not given equal consideration with the Main Library demands. The space and personnel problems in many of the branches are acute, and I feel an in-depth study of branch libraries in ARL would be worthwhile. It is not unusual for two branches covering three large subject

CRITICAL EVALUATIVE STATEMENT, continued

areas, such as Chemistry, Botany, and Geology, to be under one professional librarian. As one branch librarian told me, she had to teach her faculty members to do their own reference work since she could not possibly have time to do it. In some cases, the space conditions are critical so that one wonders how the librarian is able to maintain any equilibrium.

Faculty vs. librarian selection turned out not to be as large a problem as I thought it might. In only three of the libraries did the faculty really dominate the system. In science libraries, such as math and chemistry, faculty may be very aggressive in selection as they may also be in German and History in the Main Library. In general, the librarians and the faculty work together very amicably. One must be very careful to learn the history of each library if judgments are to be made.

There is a feeling on the part of departmental librarians, reference, and acquisition staff members that collection development bibliographers and curators are treated as an elite and that they do not have the variety of demands on their time that other staff members do. I feel that much of this could be overcome by better communication regarding job responsibilities on the part of the bibliographers.

Collection Development Policies are being developed in more and more libraries, but there is a minority hard-core who do not believe in them. Library committees for selection purposes have lost much ground, and the tendency is for more "one-on-one" discussion with the faculty on selection in their areas of special interest and knowledge.

Approval plans and blanket orders are used more heavily than I had imagined, but not by all, and they have their critics including those that use them. Some librarians worry about the long range effect on collection quality. They are regarded as one tool to beat the manpower shortage in libraries.

CRITICAL EVALUATIVE STATEMENT, continued

Shortage of funds for books and serials has very seriously curtailed retrospective purchasing in most ARL libraries. The upsurge in serials prices causes an uneasiness in all book fund managers, and this is one reason for the emphasis on use studies. Exchanges and gifts are yet another tool to fight the budget squeeze. Microforms have proved valuable for certain formats of materials, but they are only one small answer to the space and budget problems.

Cooperation turns out to be much more complex than most librarians had thought. Local faculty are less than enthusiastic if the materials they need are located elsewhere than in their library. Selfishness has not been removed from human nature, unfortunately. Major progress in this area has come only when dollars reward cooperative effort.

Storage buildings, being cheaper than regular library additions, appear to be of considerable interest to library and university administrators. Weeding is done only if it cannot be avoided.

Finally, I am very grateful to the Council on Library for the Fellowship and to Indiana University for the Sabbatical. I only hope this report and my future activities will show their faith and money has been well-placed.

Wilmer H. Baatz

Wilmer H. Baatz

February 28, 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject	Pages
Allocation Decisions.	1
Book Funds	4
Serials	11
Approval plans and blanket orders	17
Exchanges and gifts	21
Collection policies and committees	23
Retrospective	26
Organization	28
Faculty vs. Librarians in selection.	34
Cooperation	40
Interlibrary loans	47
Microforms	50
Automation	55
Reference	58
Teaching.	61
Technical Services Involvement	63
Preservation	65
Evaluation of collections	67
Use studies.	69
Weeding and storage	72
Elitism vs. No one cares	74
Space and staff problems (priority of needs).	77

ALLOCATION DECISIONS

In 11 of the 18 libraries I visited the initial allocation recommendations are made by the Chief Collection Development Officer, who is usually one of the Assistant Directors. He/she may have some help, perhaps from Technical Services, the Associate Director, a Curator's Group, or the Head of Acquisitions, but the basic responsibility is the Collection Development Officer's. Variations include: at two institutions the Head of Acquisitions makes the original recommendations for allocations; at two others it is the Head of Technical Services; at another it is a troika of the Heads of Acquisitions, Serials, and the Associate Director; at still another it is the Library Administrative group including the Library Budget Officer; and finally, one has the Director, two Associate Directors, and the Assistant Director for Planning and the Budget doing the allocation recommendations.

In nearly all cases, the responsible persons solicit input for these recommendations by letter, memo, or questionnaire, asking for any changes, special needs, variation in student enrollment, faculty, curriculum, research activities, rate of scholarly publications, inflation in cost of books and serials, or any areas which might be eliminated or reduced, any large, expensive items needed, and so on.

The actual basic allocation then is made, or approved, by the Director in seven of the 18 libraries. The Director is joined in this decision in three other libraries: by the Business Manager and the Collection Development Officer in one; by the Associate Director in another; and by the Chief of Technical Services, the Bibliographer, and the University Librarian in the third. At different libraries the decision is made by the following groups: by the Library Administrative

Board; by the Book Budget Committee, with the Director as a member; by the Library Administrative Committee, again with the Director as a member; by the Acquisitions Policy Committee of seven members; a Selection Committee of ten members, with the Collection Development Officer as a member; by the Acquisitions Head and the Collection Development Officer in concert, and in two it is the Collection Development Officer alone.

These allocations are, in all cases I believe, based largely on the history of what has gone on before in each university library system. The history may be for one year, four or five years, or even up to eight or nine. The experience of the immediate past year is generally the most significant. Usually an effort is made to adjust to unusual needs but only from "new" money.

There is a second layer of allocations in six of the libraries. In two the money for the branches (or they may be called Departmental Libraries or Schools) is divided up by a representative of the Dean (of the School, Dept., etc.) and the Librarian concerned. In one institution the funds are sent in lump sums to six different library divisions where the funds are divided. The Science Librarians in this system then meet and divide their sum, and the librarians from the Bio-Medical and the two large libraries (the old and the new "Main" libraries) divide their funds. On a second Campus of this same system, the Campus Director of Libraries and the Deans of the Schools (or their representatives) meet and divide their funds. Another state university library has four councils of librarians who "divvy up the pot;" another has the Coordinator of Science Libraries allocating the funds for the libraries under his supervision; and another, unique to my knowledge, has agreed to give the Branches and the Bibliographers a certain percentage of the total, this percentage having been vigorously discussed - fought over - during meetings

over a year's time.

While there is grumbling, on the whole the librarians seem to feel the division of funds is done as fairly as possible--they just want more money to divide. This is mostly due to the considerable amount of democracy in the process, formally and informally, by the selectors, bibliographers, curators, and branch librarians. There have been a few brave efforts to come up with a formula to improve the allocations, but all have discovered that this is indeed a difficult goal to achieve. Apparently most librarians have done a reasonable job of explaining budget problems to the faculty, for only a few commented to me on any agitation from their clientele with regard to funds. As a matter of fact, a few librarians complained to me that the faculty should exert pressure on the university administration to come up with additional funds. In summary, allocation decisions are generally made by two or more persons, usually based on the previous year's allocation, with ample provision for individual librarians to argue his/her case. There is general satisfaction with the division of funds, and it is generally agreed that they need more funds.

BOOK FUNDS

Using the Association of Research Libraries published statistics for 1975/76 and for 1976/77, for the 19 libraries (including Indiana), I find that for the latter of the two years there were for "Materials Expenditures" a total of 13 increases for a total amount of $3,950,285 or an average increase of $303,868, and there were six decreases for a total of $773,486, or an average decrease of $128,914. The net increase is $3,176,799 for the 19, on a base of $40,739,847 (average $2,144,202), or an average increase of $167,200 (7.8%) for 1976/77 for Materials, excluding Binding. This percentage of increase does not keep up with inflation.

Of those 18 I interviewed, 14 said that they got an increase for 1977/78 in total materials budget, while two were cut. One received no increase, and another only got a 2.45% increase. For two the data were inaccessible, but I think that one got an increase and one remained about even. Increases were stated in this way: one got "almost $500,000;" one, "almost $400,000;" one, "definitely $400,000;" another, "up $221,000;" another, an increase of $150,000; another, "upward $191,420;" one, a 12% increase; another, an "automatic base increase;" another stated they had over $2 million, so I gather they got perhaps a $200,000 increase; another, a "significant increase;" another, "up only $40,000;" another received an increase for books of 6.9% and for serials 10%; and finally, one received an increase of 15.1%.

Four libraries lost ground to inflation in 1977/78. One library received a major cut of over $400,000 because of unavailability of year-end funds. Another had no dollar increase; one, a 2.45% increase, and the fourth received only a $40,000 increase. Another had to cut money

for books by $298,900 as follows: $135,900 was transferred to support hourly wages, and $163,000 was given up to serials inflation. So that makes five of the 19 going the wrong financial direction. On the other hand, either eight or nine, are making significant improvements for this year over last year. The others are near meeting inflations costs without much change plus or minus.

I did some calculation to see how the books, microforms, sets, etc., fared in comparison to the current periodical subscriptions over those two years. Using ARL reports for 1975/76 and 1976/77, the Current Periodicals Expenditure was subtracted from the Materials Expenditures. The results showed that the Noncurrent Periodicals Expenditures (let us call them Books for now) in 1976/77 increased over 1975/76 in 12 of the 18 institutions (one not available--Columbia), for an increase of $2,898,639, and six institutions decreased $965,517. There was a net total increase for Books of $1,933,122 for the 18 institutions, or an average increase of $107,396 (8.8%) on a base of $21,951,791. This 8.8% increase compares to an average increase for Current Periodical Expenditures for the same period of $74,329 or 7.8% average for the same 18 institutions. Therefore, those who insist that Serials, especially science serials, are seriously tilting the budgets are on somewhat shaky grounds. However, I have found this belief is mostly a matter of emotion than of fact so I feel sure these figures will not convince one humanist or social scientist!

I also compared the Books vs. Current Serials both years at each institution and found that for the 18 (one not available) only three spent more for serials during the two years than for the non-serial materials. Five spent more for serials in one of the two years. I had expected that more would be spent for serials in the second year, but

that was not the case. Of these five, two spent more for serials the first of the two years, and three spent more in the second year. One library, Columbia, reported for only one year and that year they spent more for serials than books. The serials expenditures have NOT overtaken the expenditures for books in this group of ARL libraries.

In summary, the Materials Expenditures for 1976/77 for the 19 institutions shows an average increase of 7.8%, which does not keep up with the rate of inflation. Book budgets for 18 libraries increased an average of 8.8%, which again does not match the inflation rate.

Table 1. MATERIALS EXPENDITURES*

Institution	1975/76	1976/77	Difference
Harvard	$2,998,236	$3,272,036	+$273,800
Yale	$2,351,273	$2,513,917	+$162,644
Columbia	$1,734,282	$1,640,032	-$ 94,250
North Carolina	$1,513,760	$1,791,722	+$277,962
Minnesota	$1,914,924	$1,593,057	-$321,867
Iowa	$1,609,841	$1,959,625	+$349,784
Wisconsin	$2,163,624	$1,850,693	-$312,931
Ohio State	$1,368,653	$1,630,840	+$262,187
Michigan	$2,129,487	$2,426,320	+$296,833
Michigan State	$1,163,309	$1,365,252	+$201,943
Purdue	$1,048,170	$1,116,378	+$ 68,208
Illinois	$1,979,083	$2,819,459	+$840,376
Northwestern	$1,428,675	$1,413,940	-$ 14,735
Chicago	$1,438,465	$1,426,949	-$ 11,516
Texas	$3,208,324	$3,796,255	+$587,931
UCLA	$2,183,647	$2,241,345	+$ 57,698
Berkeley	$2,141,376	$2,257,074	+$115,698
Stanford	$2,427,272	$2,882,493	+$455,221
Indiana	$2,760,647	$2,742,460	-$ 18,187
Total		$40,739,847	
Average total		$2,144,202	+$167,200 (7.8%)

*ARL published statistics

Table 2. BOOK (of NONCURRENT PERIODICAL EXPENDITURES) FUNDS*

(Materials Expenditures minus Current Periodicals Expenditures)

Insitution	1975/76	1976/77	Difference
Harvard	$1,678,236	$1,822,036	+$143,800
Yale	$1,395,592	$1,500,143	+$104,551
Columbia	Not Available	$ 750,573	Not Available
North Carolina	$ 995.158	$1,234,747	+$239,589
Minnesota	$ 939,582	$ 643,911	-$295,671
Iowa	$ 738,266	$1,185,586	+$447,320
Wisconsin	$1,071,760	$ 840,700	-$231,060
Ohio State	$ 821,602	$ 812,573	-$ 29
Michigan	$1,351,796	$1,482,000	+$130,204
Michigan State	$ 596,666	$ 746,606	+$149,940
Purdue	$ 404,407	$ 463,468	+$ 59,061
Illinois	$ 841,079	$1,513,190	+$672,111
Northwestern	$ 786,877	$ 681,838	-$105,039
Chicago	$ 937,555	$ 709,220	-$228,335
Texas	$2,180,242	$2,525,937	+$345,695
UCLA	$1,079,541	$1,256,414	+$176,873
Berkeley	$1,315,158	$1,402,591	+$ 87,433
Stanford	$1,365,232	$1,707,294	+$342,062
Indiana	$1,528,920	$1,423,537	-$105,383
Total		$21,951,791	
Average total		$ 1,219,544	$107,396 (8.8%)

*ARL published statistics

When questioned about the adequacy of their books funds, librarians had various views. At one Eastern university the base allocations come from what has gone on for years. "We are better off than others," but they feel somewhat squeezed. At another Eastern school, "we have enough money for comprehensive subject selection." Science libraries (Eastern institution) have little money for monographs. There was a complaint from a Far Eastern Bibliographer (Eastern library) that he was not getting enough funds to build the collection adequately--he is only selecting 6,000 out of 23,000 new titles published annually in Japan.

Expensive, special purchases are invariably controlled by either the Director or the Collection Development Officer. Bibliographers in the Midwest complain mostly about not having enough money to fill in gaps in their collections. Cutbacks in availability of NDEA and Ford monies have caused problems for many libraries--they were habituated to spending on a higher level than they can now and feel frustrated. Branches especially, but also bibliographers to some extent, have turned to their departments for extra help ahd have had some success, particularly with science departments.

Some of the private institutions seem to be struggling to raise enough money to keep up with inflation and they have been relatively successful, though one of their bibliographers observed to me: "We have been absorbing financial stringencies over the years and have learned to live with it." On the other hand, state institutions in some cases have to live with rigid biennial budgets which do not respond sufficiently to pressures of inflation. In a few cases, the book funds have been "tapped" for other purposes, such as personnel or electronic security systems, or to help pay for automation. But, on the whole, the book funds are jealously watched over by the faculty and are a "no no" when it comes to

transferring from them. At least some of the private institution librarians are able to come to an understanding with their financial officers about what the library can expect over the next five years; state university librarians cannot effectively plan for over two years (some only for one), for they simply do not know what will be available in the future.

SERIALS

The collection development of Serials is divided in three parts: 1. Funds, 2. Approvals, and 3. Cancellations.

1. Serials funds

I checked the ARL Statistics Reports for 1975/76 and 1976/77 for the 18 libraries I visited, plus Indiana, and found that 14 of them had increases in Serials Expenditures totalling some $1,662,705, while four had decreases totalling $324,778, for a net increase of $1,337,927, or an average increase for the 18 libraries for serials of $74,329 (7.8%) (1976/77.) Of the 18 (one not available) the total Current Periodical Expenditures for 1976/77 was $17,148,024 or an average of $952,668. See Table 3.

Serials price increases (Library Journal) was 12.2% for 1976 over 1975 and 9.2% in 1977 over 1976. For 1977/78, from personally garnered figures, I have projected that 11 were at least meeting inflation increases for serials this year, and six definitely had additional money earmarked for new serials, above inflation increases (one had $50,000 for this purpose). Two were cutting back on serials, of necessity, since one had an overall materials reduction of 20% and the other, an increase of about 2.5%, which certainly does not cover price increases. The 20% reduction means a cutback of materials by $400,000 in one year! This translates into a cut of some 600 titles in one science library alone.

On the whole, I was surprised and encouraged that a dozen of the 19 were successfully fighting to stay even with serials inflation, while six were possibly gaining back some of the ground lost within the last five years (for all had cuts of greater or lesser extent in that period), and only two were slipping back a bit. Another unexpected situation

was that about half a dozen libraries still had their serials funds in "one large pot," and so did not really know for what subjects they were spending how much. The other two-thirds either have, or are approaching, serials financial control similar to monograph accounting, usually with both books and serials the responsibility of one fund manager, typically with some leaway for at least minor shifts of funds between the two categories. Closer financial control tends to originate from stern necessity and has been made easier to achieve by increased automation so that monthly print-outs of "allocations, expenditures, encumberances, and balances" are typical of these ARL libraries.

2. Approvals

Approvals of new serials in a dozen of the libraries is done by the Fund Manager who has responsibility for both serials and monographs, that is the bibliographer, or curator, or selector or the branch (departmental) librarian. This does not mean that the librarian blithely decides to spend his/her funds without consulting with anyone but that he/she does have the responsibility for the final decision on ordering new titles. I would venture an informed opinion that he/she does consult with one or more faculty members in three-fourths of the cases, particularly in the Branches, and especially the Science Branches. This is done for a variety of reasons: to secure the knowledge of faculty specialists, to keep clientele informed, and just for old public relations.

In four of the libraries the Collection Development Officer has to approve new serials, since he/she has the ultimate responsibility for expenditure control. In three other universities there are committees of librarians who make the final decisions on adding new serials titles to the collection. The latter is a "share the blame" technique, or "our combined shoulders are broader." In at least two of these universities there is an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" philosophy: you have

to cancel one to be able to subscribe to a new one. This is a dictum of the top Library Administration. Hopefully all the cancelled ones are not $5 ones and the new ones all $50!

3. Cancellations

Cancellations responsibilities are shared more fully with the faculty than any other part of the serials spectrum. "Share the blame" is the goal, one presumes. Actually, to my surprise (I'm surprised a lot, apparently), the librarians can do the cancellations without consulting the faculty at a half-dozen of these institutions, but they may consult the faculty, if they wish. Committees are used often for cancellations, either of librarians only, or with faculty. Cancellations for the Main Library tend to be done by a Library Committee, usually of 3-6 people, generally with inclusion of the Serials Librarian, Acquisitions, and Collection Development, plus often a representative of both Public Services and the bibliographers. One Library Committee participated to the extent of putting out general guidelines to be followed by the whole library system. A Committee of the Faculty only did the cancellations at one university; at another, a faculty committee, with the blessings of the librarian, did the entire cutting at a science branch. Librarians and faculty combined did the bob-tailing at a half-dozen others, and this combination is typical of most branches, especially science ones. At one other place, the librarians must secure the personal approval of the Collection Development Officer.

When serials are cancelled, the ones cut out first have been: (1) Duplicates, (2) Foreign languages, and (3) Low use. Many librarians commented that the cancellations had forced them, for the first time, to take a close look at their subscription lists, and that this had some beneficial results, such as getting rid of "chaff," and "junk," to quote them exactly. Use studies have achieved unparalled interest, for

librarians wish to cut finger nails and toe nails and not jugular veins! Duplicates from Main tend to be cancelled or transferred to a branch, if the subject is pertinent. The lack of use of foreign language journals reveals American lack of foreign language competence (this was commented on many times). Gifts and exchange serials, even if not costing anything, do demand space and binding expenditures. A successful gifts and exchange program can be a handicap, in a way, when it comes to cancelling subscriptions to save money. One librarian said he had an awful time reaching a dollar cutting goal because he had so many he wished to cancel that were gifts or exchanges.

The serial cancellations varied from 3% to 17%, but in big research libraries that is a lot. For example, one West Coast library cut 2,000 titles in one year; in the Midwest a Physics Branch library alone cut 600 titles in one year, and another Big Ten library cut $100,000 worth of serials when they found they could no longer get relief from their University Administration. Most of these big cancellations were 2-5 years ago, though several are still cancelling and others are in a steady state (cut one to add one). About one-third are trying to add or restore cancelled titles, while all are decidedly nervous about the future of their serials funds and are studying use "just in case." They all feel the next round, if it comes, will get to the blood and bones, meaning those serials which are actively circulating. In fact, one Midwestern Librarian told me he was cutting titles in a science branch that had circulated 2-6 times in a year. The serials situation is uneasy and may get worse.

Challenging duplicate subscriptions is now done almost universally. It can be done by the Collection Development Officer, the Serials Head, or the Head of Acquisitions. There are usually challenges and a justification is prepared and forwarded to either a Committee or the Collection Development Officer for final decision. In one case either the Bibliographer or the

Head of Serials decides.

One other subject should be aired here, I feel, and that is the comments from either Area or Language bibliographers (or curators) that because of the high inflation rate of science serials the "flow is from social sciences and the humanities to science," or "the faculty has the feeling that science serials are taking more money." Another comment is, "serials are eating up the budget; there are fewer dollars for monographs." The latter, undoubtedly is nearer the truth for sciences than the former. Where there are fund managers, for science, which is in about two-thirds of the cases, it is up to fund managers to decide between serials and monographs, within their funds, and the money is not taken from some poor, defenseless humanist or social scientist but comes from the science fund manager's own book budget. In the remaining one-third of the cases, the "one big pot" serials libraries, apparently the money is sufficient so far to cover the whole field of serials demands so they need not refine their accounting down to determine where the serials money goes. There probably is some tendency to use "new money" to cover serials inflation first, then distribute the remainder.

Table 3. CURRENT PERIODICAL EXPENDITURES*

Institution	1975/76	1976/77	Differences
Harvard	$1,320,000	$1,450,000	+$130,000
Yale	$ 955,681	$1,013,774	+$ 58,093
Columbia	Not Available	$ 889,459	Not Available
North Carolina	$ 518,602	$ 556,975	+$ 38,373
Minnesota	$ 975,342	$ 949,146	-$ 26,196
Iowa	$ 871,575	$ 774,039	-$ 97,536
Wisconsin	$1,091,864	$1,009,993	-$ 81,871
Ohio State	$ 556,051	$ 818,267	+$262,216
Michigan	$ 777,691	$ 944,320	$166,629
Michigan State	$ 566,643	$ 618,646	+$ 52,003
Purdue	$ 643,763	$ 652,910	+$ 9,147
Illinois	$1,138,004	$1,306,269	+$168,265
Northwestern	$ 641,798	$ 732,102	+$ 90,304
Chicago	$ 500,910	$ 717,729	+$216,819
Texas	$1,028,082	$1,270,318	+$242,236
UCLA	$1,104,106	$ 984,931	-$119,175
Berkeley	$ 826,218	$ 854,483	+$ 28,265
Stanford	$1,062,040	$1,175,199	+$113,159
Indiana	$1,231,727	$1,318,923	+$ 87,196
Total		$17,148,024	
Average total		$ 952,668	+$ 74,329 (7.8%)

*ARL published statistics

APPROVAL PLANS AND BLANKET ORDERS

Of the 18 libraries I visited, I found that 12 had approval plans for the U.S. general trade books: six with Baker and Taylor, 5 with Blackwell North American, and 1 with Coutts, and with Ballen having the Science Libraries at one institution and the Health Science Libraries at another. That leaves six plus Indiana without approval plans. Without exception everyone uses at least blanket orders, or approval plans, for foreign publications--though one large Eastern university apparently uses them to a minimum. As far as I can determine, everyone uses Harrassowitz and with almost unanimous satisfaction (a few grumbled about not receiving some East German materials). In my opinion, this is the dealer with the highest overall satisfaction rating. Apparently the favorite dealer for French materials in this group is Touzot, but Blancheteau and Stechert-McMillan are also used. The most-used dealer for the United Kingdom is Stevens and Brown, with Blackwell England, Harding, and Rota also serving. Slavic is shared by three dealers: Les Livres Etrangers, Four Continents, and Kubon & Sagner. Latin Americanists use many blanket-order dealers, from four to 40, literally. Many different dealers are used for the Middle East; almost everyone seems to have a different set-up in this field. African materials are hard to come by, and the dealer mentioned most frequently, but with reservations on the service provided, is AILS. Several universities have approval agreements with the two big English university presses, Cambridge and Oxford. Springer-Verlag and Elsevier furnish their own publications at discount. East Asian librarians tend to use dealers in Hong Kong and Taiwan plus various Japanese firms, but a pattern did not emerge. There were definite complaints about recent service from Porter Libros in Spain. Some libraries use Molina and a variety of other dealers. Italian dealers most often mentioned were: Casalini Libri,

Libreria Del Porcellino, and Centro Di. Using one man as a dealer in Africa or in the Middle East is not unique, and I believe this is also the case in Latin America.

Why are approval plans and blanket orders used at all? The answer appears two-fold. "We lack enough subject specialists or bibliographers, so must go to approval plans," is the most frequent explanation, and the second reason is that the library administration feels that there is a savings of both professional and clerical expense, that they get the books more promptly, and interdisciplinary problems are also avoided. On the other hand, there were complaints of slowness, and comments that it was amazing the gaps the approval plan left. Some librarians felt that the complaints resulted from the university library's failure to prepare good profiles. There is no question that care must be taken in preparing the profiles and in carefully monitoring them. There seems to be general agreement among those using approval plans that the major plans are adequate for English language, general trade publications, and that they get from 40% to 75% of their materials from approval plans in this category. But for the unusual, periphereal, or such things as conference proceedings and colloquims, approval plans are less efficient. The percentage of returns varies considerably, from 3% to 14%, with one Transportation library returning 50% to a more specialized dealer. One library representative, whose library had an approval plan for the U.S. publications but does not now, commented, "With approval or blanket orders, you tend to run out of money," which they did. Many foreign blanket orders have a dollar ceiling on them as well as a profile. Both Ohio State and Texas select from pre-publishing catalogs from Four Continents , which is an approval plan with librarians doing the selection.

Several collection development librarians expressed concern that

the quality of the collection could suffer over the next 20-30 years with the majority of the selection being done by dealer employees, hundreds or thousands of miles away, as compared to the selection being done by librarians on site who know the curricula and the research needs of their primary clientele. The ones who do not use approval plans and blanket orders for the U.S. publications feel that they will end up with better collections. Only time will tell. At least two of the 18 that had approval plans have dropped them.

When it comes to foreign blanket orders, almost everyone feels that with the problems of short runs and limited editions (printings) of publications, slowness in securing bibliographical information, particularly for the vernacular, and the unusual ways of doing business in some foreign countries, that some dependence on blanket orders is essential if they are to get the bulk of what they need for their collection building. These, plus gifts and exchanges, make it possible to considerably narrow the gaps in collection building, but not to eliminate them, especially for Africa, Latin America, Asia, Slavic, and East European countries.

Some comments from librarians about blanket orders and approvals were: We got too many titles of minor importance; they do not send enough, for they are too conservative in order to avoid returns. One unusual tactic is that the books are sent around to the branches, where the librarians select the ones they want and send them on to Acquisitions, which then types up slips for the books they want and returns the remainder. An interesting variation occurs in a library which uses the same dealer for individual ordering as for their approval plan, basically to avoid duplication ("do not send if already on order"). Another does just the opposite, and gets all its non-approval books from another dealer, by contract at that, and there appears to be no problem about duplication!

The Bio-Medical library in one large system has set up its own approval plan with about 30 major publishers in 50 fields of medicine with biological sciences only covered by another approval dealer. In this same system the science-technology libraries have another dealer for its "across the board" purchases plus smaller agreements with individual publishers such as Springer-Verlag and several American ones. These are all a part of a total of over 40 approval plans used by different parts of this system. The moral of the story? Tailor your plans and dealers to your particular needs.

EXCHANGES AND GIFTS

Undoubtedly the largest exchange of library materials programs are with Slavic and East European partners, and the West Coast libraries have the most vigorous exchange and gift departments. One library has five staff members, one has four, and they accomplish a lot. One university library has some 4,500 exchange partners, including 100 Russian and 100 Polish; they receive 15,000 to 18,000 serials on exchange, and one Branch librarian told me that this same university library overall purchased only 28,000 current serials out of 80,000 received! They have a budget of $60,000 to purchase for their exchange partners, either serials or monographs. They buy many of their own university publications at reduced prices to use for exchange. While their Latin American program is growing, some 90% of this huge exchange program is with the Soviet Union and East Europe. I was very impressed by the energy and enthusiasm shown; I believe the library gets a lot for its dollar.

The other big West Coast exchange program is so successful that the Slavic Curator told me he gets over 50% of his materials this way. They also buy from their own university press and from the independent libraries on their campus. The exchange in titles, foreign for 1976/77 was 10,547 with domestic being only 870. A third West Coast library also says it gets most of its Russian materials on exchange. The Midwest and East also carry on vigorous exchanges, but few, if any, have any formally designated Gifts and Exchange Departments. These exchanges are carried out, or supervised, by the Slavic bibliographer in most cases, or there are personnel in the Acquisitions or Serials Departments, or both, who do the work initiated by the bibliographer or curator.

One Eastern Latin American bibliographer says he carries out a "huge exchange program" working through Cuban libraries; he buys Congressional Quarterly for them. He also gets gifts from the Latin American governments. A Midwestern University librarian has kept up exchanges with Peking, to "keep the foot in the door," even though they could get most materials through Hong Kong that they now get from Peking.

A Big Ten library for Physics-Astronomy-Math has been very successful with exchanges (using local mathematical journals for exchange), but this turned out to be a headache when it came to cancelling titles to save money, for he found that in a study that 55% of exchange titles were not used and 65% of gifts were not used--and he could cancel a lot and not save a dime! A Math library in another Midwest Library gets one-third of all its journals on exchange. A Transportation library built up exchanges based on "Current Literature in Traffic and Transportation." Eastern universitites have successful exchanges for business and medical libraries. One Midwestern state university library handles exchanges and gifts for a state-wide academic libraries system and exchanges over 20,000 items while reviewing up to 120,000 pieces a year, and can sell unneeded items if they wish, with the money going to Acquisitions.

When it comes to handling gifts, two West Coast libraries have impressive ongoing book sales from which they garner $10,000 to $15,000 a year. In all cases, first choice goes to those interested in adding titles to the Main Library system, then the titles are made available for exchange, and finally for sale or credit.

COLLECTION POLICIES AND COMMITTEES

Policies

Only four universities, out of the 19, have current Collection Development Policies covering the whole library system; three others have policies dated 1970, 1972, and 1973/74. Efforts are being made to up-date these. Two have them partially done: one for Branches only, and another has most of a subject-by-subject analysis completed, but not all. Two libraries have policies in final draft form, and another is "actively working on it" with a person assigned 20 hours a week to the project. Seven have "none" with a little done in a few scattered branches or, nearly always, the Undergraduate Library. Undergraduate libraries seem to be quite conscious of the desirability of such policy statements, put much work on them, and tend to use them for budget allocations. So, for about half the 19 universities, Collection Policies have been developed, and are generally being followed. Some policies use the Library of Congress classification numbers to indicate the depth of coverage, and some also have collection responsibilities assigned by these class numbers.

Only a small minority felt that Collection Development Policies were not desirable. Perhaps a half-dozen individuals told me they felt it was a waste of time to write them, mostly because they changed too often. One grimly told me that he felt them unnecessary, and his supervisor informed me that he thought the man would quit rather than write such policies! Others who do not have policies feel that they are not priority or are not worth the special effort. Most librarians who have policies feel that they are useful guidelines for their staff and also are good defense insurance and good public relations with the faculty and

university administration. In one case, there was a request from the University Planning Department for an acquisitions policy, with the idea being to define policy and arrive at a targeted funding understanding.

I feel that production of a Collection Development Policy forces the librarians doing the selecting to think out what they are doing and arrive at priorities while examining what has been done in the past. Since, in most instances, they must confer with their clientele in this exercise, at least minimal communication has to be carried out with their departments or subject faculty. In our own case (Indiana), this year I am requiring the signature of the Department Head and the Chairman of the Library Committee be on the Collection Development Policy statement; then there should be little doubt that the faculty and deparmental administration concur in what is there. In the published Collection Development statements (by other universities), faculty concurrence has been achieved.

Committees

Only five of the universities visited have an overall Collection Development Committee or Council, and one library has three overall committees: for the humanities, social sciences, and historical studies plus a Science Coordinator with committees in each subject. But every library had committees, or individuals who worked with the library staff, representing the faculty, variously called liaison, representatives, or advisors. This is especially true in the science branches where they vary from dictating all selection to being in an inactive phase. In only a few cases was there resentment on the part of the librarians about faculty committees or faculty participation, and in each case it was because the current librarian had inherited a situation where his/her predecessors were inadequate, or the position had been filled by a

clerical, or had not been filled for a year or two, or there was a long tradition of the faculty spending "their" money. Many librarians lamented to me that it was difficult to get significant faculty assistance and advice, that either the interest was not there (especially in engineering libraries) or that the faculty felt the selection was being carried out at least adequately and believed the librarian should carry out the duties!

Broadly speaking, it seems to me that the relationship between the librarians and the faculty on selection, especially in the branches, is excellent--that more is done "one on one" (one librarian asking one faculty member for his/her advice in a specialty area) than in any other way and that this is working out quite well. It is only when the collection building is not done well and the materials are not there when needed, that the faculty tend to rise up and exert their power. In the Main Libraries there are scattered faculty committees from subject departments which are concerned with collection building, but this is usually the result of the librarian's initiative to seek faculty support in projects, such as building up the collection in a special subject field, Latin American education, for example. Perhaps more common is the very interested faculty member, who perhaps "should have been a librarian", who has helped to build the collection over a period of years, usually to the pleasure of the librarian concerned, but occasionally not. Working with individual faculty members is the usual procedure for curators, bibliographers, and selectors in the geographical area fields, as well as those in humanities and social sciences.

RETROSPECTIVE COLLECTING

With the prevalence of Approval Plans and Blanket Orders in most libraries for purchasing "current books", acquisitions allocations to the branches (departmental libraries) in many cases really are for serials plus non-current buying, that is anything older than one and a half to two years. Only three of the 19 libraries indicated to me that their retrospective buying was carried on at a level they considered desirable. Most librarians felt curtailed, not only by lack of money, but also by the lack of staff to do a respectable job of searching and locating the needed material. One of the satisfied three actually maintained that they can buy what they need retrospectively and that budget is not a concern. The fortunate ones have a special "General Research" fund for materials published before 1900.

I did hear some complaints that approval plans discriminate against some subjects such as History of Art with its need for foreign and retrospective buying. One Slavic bibliographer set up a separate antiquarian fund to determine exactly how much is being spent in this field. Another enterprising librarian uses money from gift sales or credit and from Friends of the Library to finance his retrospective purchasing. Others commented that they bought retrospectively only when new subjects were added to the curriculum, or when reprints of old classics became available, or when they got specific research requests from faculty or graduate students.

I have a strong feeling that retrospective buying has suffered greatly from curtailment of funds. My research confirms Hendrik Edelman's (Cornell) oft-expressed concern that no library is buying exhaustively in very many fields; so that there is no place in the country where

you can find everything you need for research in many subjects. Edelman says the top 40 libraries are buying basically only to support their curricula and the research of their faculty and graduate students, but exhaustive collecting efforts are not being made and certainly not being coordinated. Only at Harvard did I hear anything to contradict this in any way.

ORGANIZATION

There is considerable similarity among the types of bibliographers in the 19 ARL libraries I visited. Area (geographical) bibliographers are typical; for example, there are 15 full-time Slavic and East European area bibliographers or curators. Also there are five part-time bibliographers assigned to this area: one divides his time between Slavic and Germanic; another is Head of the Catalog Department in her library as well as Slavic selector; one Slavic bibliographer also covers German, Dutch, and Linguistics; one is employed part-time just for Slavic; and finally one covers four languages including Russian.

Another popular Area bibliographer is one to cover the Far East, usually China and Japan, often also Korea, and sometimes the range is as far as "half of Central Asia." This person may be designated as the specialist for "East Asian," "Far East," the "Asian Collection," or even "Asian American." There are at least 11 full-time bibliographers in this field, with one doing some cataloging and Sanskrit, and one handling material on Americans of Asian descent.

The Middle or Near East is also well-represented by bibliographers specializing in the area, though the geography and the languages included may vary. There are approximately 11 bibliographers for this special area. One university has a bibliographer assigned to Africa and the Middle East. Two have a full-time bibliographer for Arabic and Jewish, and they cooperate very well! Besides the two Arabic and Jewish bibliographers at the same libraries, one university reported a separate person for Hebrew in addition to a bibliographer for the Middle East, and another library has a separate Jewish Studies person as well as one for the Near East. One covers "South and West Asia,"

which was defined as the Middle East (the West Asian part!). Some libraries attempt to cover the Moslem countries from Africa to Pakistan; others do not go quite that far around the world.

Another well-represented area is Latin America, although sometimes this includes the Iberian Peninsula. There are 10 Latin American bibliographers and three Ibero-American Studies specialists in my survey libraries.

Six libraries have full-time African specialists plus one which has two and a half people. Two schools have people who split their time--one with Middle East and one with Spanish and Portuguese. There is one university that has just a "contact" person assigned, not really a bibliographer.

South and Southeast Asia are not as fully covered as other areas of the world. There is one librarian assigned exclusively to Southeast Asia, three who cover both South and Southeast Asia, three who are responsible for South Asia only, one who's territory is South Asia and the Middle East, and one who selects for Indo-Pacific, which means the Pacific, Southeast Asia and South Asia. The vernacular coverage in these areas is spotty, while the English language publications originating in the area are emphasized.

There are also a few rather unique bibliographical assignments: two for Scandanavia plus another that has Scandanavia included in his Social Science assignment, and another included with "Modern Languages and Linguistics." There are two for Medieval and Renaissance Studies; and there is one for a combination of Ancient Near East and Classics.

The West European Languages and Literatures (Germanic, French and Italian, Spanish and Portuguese) bibliographical assignments vary

incredibly from all of them being assigned to one person in two institutions to single language and literature assignments. One favorite assignment is Romance Languages and Literatures, and another is a combination of French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese but not including Germanic. The combinations with these languages and literatures can be fascinating, for example, they are combined with Classics or with Classics, Theatre and Romance Languages. One has combined all Romance and Germanic languages, linguistics, comparative literature, and Scandanavian. Only in three of the 10 are these languages and literatures not strongly covered, for in these institutions they are handled incidentally by someone who has other assignments.

Humanities and social science bibliographers were historically the first hired, along with the area curators or bibliographers. A third of the libraries retain these broad subject assignments, but most libraries further divide these assignments. The variations boggle the mind. For example, the Collection Development Council at one of the best ARL libraries consists of some 30 selectors, bibliographers, and curators; another library has 16 (one part-time) and all doing one day's stint a week in Reference; others have 13, 11, and so on. This usually does NOT include the selection done in the many dozens of branches or departmental libraries. Bibliographers may do the selection in seven or eight subjects, serve as a Reference librarian, and also supervise a Branch and a Central Library Department (this is a fact), all, theoretically, in a 40-hour week! I have more than minor reservations on either: (1) how well he/she does the job or (2) how many hours he/she puts in! One Social Sciences bibliographer stated that he was responsible for selection in twenty-one subject fields. He says he obviously cannot keep up with all these fields, so he tells the faculty that <u>they</u> have the responsibility to recommend titles.

The variety of subjects results from two factors, the need of the institution and the abilities or predilection of the bibliographer. The history of the library's development explains some assignments, and the bibliographer's educational background or experience may determine assignments. Two illustrations from one institution: one bibliographer covers United States history and literature (not social sciences), folklore, Indians, Afro-American, also all humanities and social sciences for Canada, Australia, and New Zealand plus also modern Middle East history in western languages; the second bibliographer covers all West European social sciences plus all of psychology and sports. Both are excellent people. There are bibliographers who cover one subject, such as history, English, or literature, American Studies (interesting to define), history of science, women's studies, black studies, theatre and drama, political science and economics. The more typical assignments are: (1) Philosophy, social work, sociology, psychology, and religion, (2) Political science, sociology, social welfare, industrial relations, economics and ethnic studies. I wonder what they do with their spare time after they complete their committee work, their reference, liaison work and perhaps teach some library instruction classes!

Branch or Departmental libraries report to an intersting array of administrators. Of the 19 libraries in the study, eight branch libraries report to the Assistant or Associate Director for Public Services, two report directly to the Director, and two report to the Head, Departmental Libraries or Head, Branch Libraries. Of the remaining seven libraries, each has a different organization: one reports to the Assistant Director, Administrative Services; one, to the Associate University Librarian; another, to the Assistant Director for Collection Development; another, to the Assistant Head of Science Library; a fifth, to the Assistant University Librarian for Research and Instructional Services; a sixth,

to the Assistant Director for Resources and Reference Services; and at the seventh the Branches report to five different Assistants or Directors of the six parts of the library system. None reports to the Technical Services Director! Typically, therefore, the Branches report to the Assistant Director for Public Services.

Within the Branches, the only additional administrative subdivision may to be some sort of coordinator for the science/technology libraries, i.e., Science, Physical Sciences, Engineering and Science, Physical Sciences and Technology, or Institute of Technology Libraries. Typically this person is in charge of one of these libraries and is general supervisor of the remainder. This is true for nine of the libraries. The one exception to this is where the Coordinator is based in one library, where he also supervises technical services for the science libraries, but is not directly in charge of the base library This Coordinator in most cases has considerable influence when it comes to deciding the distribution of acquisitions funds for these Science libraries. The supervision, in most cases, is rather "loose" with each science or technology librarian enjoying considerable independence, although I can think of one definite exception where the coordination is close (and good).

In none of the departmental or branch libraries did I hear complaints of "too close" supervision. On the contrary, some branch or departmental librarians feel that the Main Library administrative people simply do not know enough about what goes on in the branches to comprehend the problems, especially problems of space and personnel and, to a lesser degree, of money for materials and equipment. They would like better or more vigorous representation in the highest councils of their library administration. Lack of personal visits by library administration to the

branches was lamented; I feel much more visiting with Branch librarians "on their own turf" is a decided priority for understanding of problems and better public relations.

FACULTY vs. LIBRARIANS IN SELECTION

Inquiring into who does the selection of library materials, faculty or librarians, I found that far more selection is done by librarians than I had suspected. This is particularly true in the Main Libraries, which tend to be largely the collections for the humanities and social sciences. Of the 19 libraries, only in three do the faculty actually have control of what is selected for the Main Library. One is on the East Coast, two are in the Midwest, and all three are state universities. Of the three libraries with faculty selecting the materials, one has Book Chairmen for the academic departments, about 60 of them, who have total control of the funds. A second university has library fund chairmen for all academic departments, and the actual spending authority goes to the teaching faculty, though many librarians are making the decisions. At the third library the faculty library representatives look upon the allocations as "faculty money," and like the authority to spend it, but not the responsibility, and they tend to forget that it is really library money. At this university, the departments or schools get most of the money, and the selection responsibilities are shared with the branch librarians: the librarians do the more general selection, and the faculty, the specific. In the Main Library at this same institution, which is the concern in this paragraph, the faculty representatives control all but 4% of the selection, with the librarians having "considerable influence" over 30% of the faculty-controlled acquisitions. I was told "the librarians are trying to get more collection development responsibilities into the main library--it's political."

In the Main library of 16 library systems, the faculty initiates

from 3% to 15% tops, with the average between 5% and 10%. In most cases I am speaking of humanities and social sciences including the area and vernacular programs with library staff members having specific responsibilities for collection building in their areas and the faculty input, as well as that from the graduate students, flows in through the librarians. From this group I heard many more complaints regarding not enough interest shown in selection by faculty in contrast to any complaints of unwelcomed intrusions by faculty in selection. Of course, there are individual exceptions where faculty are quite active in helping with collection building particularly in German and History. In one Western library a certain German professor has been building the collection in the Main Library for many years and now shares the responsibility about 50/50 with the bibliographer who actively welcomes this input and gives the professor credit for his outstanding work over the years. In a of couple cases, the History Department has divided up its funds and given it out--$1,000 each to 10 professors--and each professor happily spends the funds anyway he/she sees fit (on library materials however!). This is definitely the exception. In most cases, the bibliographers, while retaining the authority and responsibility for building the collections in their areas, actively solicit and get help from the faculty in the latter's speciality areas. While Library Committee members or faculty representatives may be consulted most often for selection purposes, and in some departments all faculty orders are funneled through the library representatives, the bibliographers learn who is interested in what field and tend to go directly to the specialist who can help them with that area's problems. There is more "one on one" faculty input in the case of bibliographers in humanities and social sciences than there is formal input through committees and library representatives. In summary, for the Main Library, largely

Humanities and Social Sciences, at least 90% of the selection is by the librarians.

In the Science Branch Library selection, the faculty of the Math libraries are consistently the most active, but even here the librarians do somewhat more of the selection than the faculty. Of 13 Math libraries only four had the faculty selecting over 50% (one said "over 50%," two, 70%, and one, 85%). At two universities I felt the Library Committee in one and the Department Head in the other shared the selection responsibility with the librarian, and in each case the books-on-approval were selected by the librarians. At seven of the institutions, the librarians did the selection: one 70%, one 80%, and five 100%, they averred.

The selection for four medical or bio-medical libraries is done 90% to 95% by the librarians. Of seven Life Sciences or Biology Libraries visited, at only one did the faculty do most of the selection (75% to 80%), and at the others the librarians did more than 90%. Of nine geology or geo-sciences libraries, in only two were the faculty mostly responsible for collection building, one 75% to 80%, and in the other the faculty had the entire final authority. Of the seven libraries where selection was mostly made by librarians, the percentage varied from 65%, 80%, 97% and 100%. Two of these librarians said they did the selection but with faculty assistance or with faculty help for peripheral material, and one librarian just did "most" of it.

At Engineering libraries it was 8-1 for librarians doing most of the selection. At one the faculty apparently does about 70% of the selection; at the others the librarians do anywhere from 70%, to 80%, to 90% and "all." Of seven Physics libraries, two had the faculty doing most of the selection (over 50% and 70%). Others had librarians

doing "most," 95%, 97%, or just the librarian did it, period. The one separate Astronomy library has its selection done 40% to 50% by the faculty. One Geography and Map librarian did 95% of his selection.

In summary, selection in 38 science libraries is done mostly by the librarians; in 10, by the faculty; and in two, it is shared about 50/50. That means about 75% of the selection in science branches is done by librarians.

I doubt if anyone will be surprised to learn that most selection in non-science branch libraries is by the librarians. Of seven Fine Arts libraries, five have the librarian doing the selection from 60% to 100%, but one does have the faculty doing it from 70% to 75%, and at one other, the librarian shares selection with the faculty but with the librarian having final approval. At one Architectural library the librarian approves the suggestions of the faculty; while at an Art and Architectural library the librarian does 75% of the selection. At five Music libraries, librarians make a clean sweep of selection with the least being 80% to 90% by the librarian, rest above 95%. Librarians also dominate selection at three Library Science libraries, at four Social Work libraries, at two Education, and three Education-Psychology libraries, at three business libraries and at single libraries for Journalism, Social Science, Latin American, and Transportation.

The selection done in the various Undergraduate Libraries is exclusively by the librarians except that the books put on Reserve are from faculty lists. The UGL staffs do a vigorous job in trying to match their collections to their clientele; I would guess that they are the most dedicated to this goal of any group of librarians.

Special Collections are built by their library staffs with individual suggestions from interested faculty.

Not counting the Undergraduate Libraries and Special Collections, of the non-science branches about 25 have librarians doing the selection; two, faculty; and one sharing between faculty and librarians. Of the all Branches in the study some 63 have librarians doing the selection, 12 have faculty, and three share. This means 76% librarian-controlled selection. Considering the fact that 90% of the selection for the Main libraries is made by librarians, it can be said that 80% of current selection at the large ARL libraries is now done by librarian selection specialists. I am not commenting whether this is good or bad, but it is a fact.

It does seem to me that a direct correlation can be made. If the teaching faculty feel the libraries have their materials and can furnish them when desired and if they have confidence in the library staff, they have little need to participate in the selection--they feel that is the librarian's job, and the faculty have their own full-time jobs to work at. Only when the faculty feels the collection or service is unsatisfactory, or when there is a long history of direct faculty selection, or a new faculty member or subject field is added to the curriculum, then they tend to get more active and aggressive. From the librarians, I heard more grumbling that the faculty was not interested or active enough in selection than that they were trying to take over selection when they should not. In a few cases, the librarian insisted on faculty participation, especially in science branches where the librarian did not feel completely competent over a wide field or fields. On the other hand, a couple of incompetent librarians in a row will get a faculty actively concerned about their collection(s) and services. Or if a Director is undiplomatic enough in handling faculty complaints, they just might flex their muscles and bring the library more directly under their active control.

The current situation regarding selection of materials at any ARL university can be understood only if you learn enough about its past history to fit the pieces together. This is particularly true of individual branches or subject fields. But overall the faculty now relies on the librarians to fill in the general strength of the various fields and they assist, when asked, in special areas of interest or competence.

COOPERATION

Cooperation among university libraries is not as easy or widespread as many idealists would like it to be. After all, if the faculty insists, as some do, they must have an item in their library when it now is only a block away in another branch, it is certain that inter-university cooperation would raise some faculty objections!

In my visits I heard considerable discussion regarding the Center for Research Libraries, the Research Libraries Group (Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the NY Public), the Stanford-Berkeley efforts, Chicago-Northwestern-CRL (and a few others in some cases), the Indiana Cooperative Program, and other state-wide systems, a little about MIDLNET, the Regional Medical Cooperative program, the California Shared Purchases effort and other California cooperative efforts, Latin American and Middle East librarians' cooperation, and some local efforts. While some university administrations are interested in library cooperative efforts, I found the faculty not interested.

The most frequently mentioned cooperative endeavor is the Center for Research Libraries to which most, but not all, of the ARL libraries I visited belong. In fact one library was debating internally about CRL membership when I was there. There definitely is a question in various people's mind whether or not they are getting their money's worth out of CRL, for it can cost $16,000 to $22,000 to belong, and that could buy a lot of books. Most libraries seem to think they are getting their money's worth out of it, but the enthusiasm for CRL's services varies widely. CRL is used in many ways by its members: As a resource for newspapers, foreign dissertations, state documents (members are able to discard because of CRL's holdings, as well as borrow), for journals

either old or out of the subject fields of the borrowing library, for the British National Lending Library Service, for microfilms of sets or series, for the demand purchase program, for archives collections, for Asian, Russian, Belgian and Italian history and documentary materials. Members are able to cancel some newspapers because of the availability on microfilm at CRL; they are able to use CRL reports on new additions to the CRL collection to avoid ordering expensive runs or duplicating their holdings.

One recently-joined member of CRL in a 4-month's period had 120 requests completed out of 154, that is about an 80% success rate; they were pleased. One library retains some titles of serials for only 12 months and then depends on CRL for backfiles.

There were also some negative comments regarding CRL. One librarian said his institution had to cut back on materials funds and as a result became more dependent on CRL, but he felt CRL had cut back some on their subscriptions and not told anyone. Similiarly, another librarian commented that someone should check on CRL science serials project to see what the actual coverage is, for he believes CRL did some cancellations of subscriptions without notifying members. At another institution, a librarian said that while a catalog of CRL cards are maintained in the public area, it is used only by the bibliographers. Another feels CRL serves smaller members more than big research members, and another librarian said that his experience with CRL was not all that great (they had not ordered many of his recommendations), and he feels CRL wants members to depend on BNLL. Some additional negative comments from different universities were: minimal use of CRL; use CRL rarely; years since borrowed from CRL. On the whole, CRL seems to pass the test with its members; that is they seem to think it is worth retaining

membership, but few are wildly enthusiastic!

I spoke to librarians in three of the four libraries who are members of the Research Libraries Group project, for I did not visit the New York Public Library. So far the member libraries have concentrated on serial petitioning, serials cancellations, expensive sets, and preservation. Only about 4% of the new serials were petitioned in the first year. Yale and Columbia seemed much more enthusiastic about the cooperative project than did Harvard. The latter seems to think more and more dependence is on them, for example of master copies assigned (serials) 44% were to Harvard, 34% to NY Public, 13% to Columbia and 10% to Yale. Harvard hopes that the cooperative technical services will pay off for them. Yale felt they had saved almost $50,000 in one year on expensive purchases which they did not have to make. But I feel this program is not far enough along to make any judgment on it; I certainly hope it proves out to be as useful for Harvard and NYPL as it appears to be to Yale and Columbia now. I believe the tie-in to the Library of Congress in cataloging and serials may be a most important development in the program.

Rather heartening is the cooperation between Berkeley and Stanford. The cooperation is funded by grant funds from two foundations, for three years, and it has just finished its first year. I feel both schools are working hard to make it succeed, for both have a specific person assigned as Project Coordinator and both persons appear to be energetic, intelligent, and determined to make it succeed. They have a shuttle bus making many runs a day, appropriately named the Gutenberg Bus, and they have reciprocal borrowing for graduate students (not undergraduates), faculty, and academic staff. All students may use both

collections on-site. The long range goals are collection development cooperation for expensive sets and expensive microforms, and to creat the best possible public service climate--a feeling that it is almost as easy to use one collection as the other. Now they can call Document Delivery Service and ask them to locate and send a book over. They are also working on a Joint Union List of Serials which they hoped to get out in March 1978, but they find that different cataloging policies have made this difficult. They have different hours of opening and different decisions on what is non-circulating. The independent libraries on the two campuses had to be convinced to go along with the cooperation, and this took a bit of doing, especially at one of them. Stanford has a Provost's Task Force on the Library Plan for the Future and this group is looking not only at future expenditures but also at participation in networks and cooperative programs. Stanford is also working on closer cooperation between the main library (university) system and the Coordinate (independent) libraries, such as the Hoover and five other campus libraries. I understand there is much unofficial cooperation going on between the staffs at Berkeley and Stanford, such as checking out potential purchases or subscriptions and in arranging for loans of materials. There is good leadership contributing to the cooperation here; I feel it will "go."

Another interesting California cooperative development is the Shared Purchases program of the nine University of California libraries. The Shared Purchases program received 1% off the top of the materials funds the first year, 2% the second, and it will be 3% the third year. Last year there was $99,000 in the fund, and the Collection Development Heads met to decide on what to buy and in which university library it is to be placed. I heard complaints from two science-technology librarians that they were not in favor of this Shared Purchases Program

because they felt the Collection Development Officers are "too humanities oriented." They want purchases to be made in their fields.

A Latin American area specialist in California commented that there was real cooperation at the regional level in California, called the Southern California Conference on International Studies. There is a Latin American Committee within the Conference and a Library Sub-Committee which meets regularly three times a year to discuss cooperation. They have put together a regional list of newspaper holdings in about 18-20 libraries, even including a couple of large non-member libraries. They have applied for funds for a project to acquire all available dissertations on film; this regional cooperation has been operating now for three years, and the future looks good. They hope to expand to include Northern California.

Both Latin American and Middle East Librarians have long been concentrating on cooperative endeavors. The Latin American Microfilming Project (LAMP), in cooperation with CRL, has been active and a success for some years. Africanists have the CAMP microfilming project. There were a series of three meetings on cooperation sponsored by the Middle East Librarians Association (MELA) held at Harvard, Michigan, and Louisville. They publish a useful newsletter and have various cooperative projects started. The first was a survey of the holdings of the members. These efforts of the participating librarians have made them better informed and have led to cooperation on a personal basis where it is impossible to make a formal agreement.

Northwestern and Chicago universities have been making determined efforts to get more cooperation going, not only between themselves but also including Newberry, CRL, and Chicago Circle in some of their efforts. Northwestern and Chicago are working on a newspapers on

microforms list including the CRL holdings; they are trying to come up with a serials list of the two libraries; they are trying for some cooperation in buying and for freer access for their clientele to each other's services. One rather unique bit of cooperation is that the Music Bibliographer at the University of Chicago has been doing the music selection for Newberry for 4-5 years, and Chicago students may use the Newberry materials if they have a letter to prove them legitimate users.

The various state Interlibrary Loan Systems, such as MINITEX in Minnesota, WILS in Wisconsin, ILLINET in Illinois, the ACCESS system in Michigan, all are very successful, basically since there is a pay-off to the library doing the service work, either in so much money for each service, or an overall budget, or more materials money for them from the state legislatures. The various Regional Medical Networks are also successful because of some underwriting for services, at least indirectly, by the National Library of Medicine.

There are various local cooperative efforts, such as in Ohio where 11 libraries at nine institutions have produced a Fine Arts Union Card Catalog and use it cooperatively. There is much unofficial cooperation as between Michigan, Michigan State and Wayne State, initiated usually by counterparts in the three institutions.

Indiana, Purdue, Ball State, and Indiana State universities in Indiana have had a Cooperative University Libraries Program since July 1, 1969, and it has been very successful. It is based on payment for services: Ball State University and Indiana State University together pay for a position on the staffs at both Indiana University and Purdue University. The job of these two professional staff members is to give immediate service to the other two institutions which do not have

the research collections Indiana and Purdue have, thus Ball State and Indiana State avoid having to build up collections in certain areas or in greater depth. They are to devote 100% of their time to these services which are an immediate interlibrary loan service, reference service, and photocopying. Main entry cataloging cards are even furnished for vernacular cataloging if the requesting institution does not have the language expertize needed. Of course, Indiana and Purdue also service each other's requests and those of the regional campuses. Indiana State also has been sending a bus load of students and faculty to Indiana University on Saturdays, a service which started in the spring of 1977 and continued in the Fall Semester of 1977. Indiana University librarians are on hand to help them use the collections.

One of the stranger things I encountered in talking about cooperation with the many librarians is that a number of them told me of various instances in which the faculty either stopped a cooperative effort or made it quite clear they disapproved of it. They are interested only in having the material in "their" library and resist cooperative efforts. This is not true of all and less ture of university administrators, possibly because the latter envision a cost savings in these efforts.

INTERLIBRARY LOANS

At least eight out of the 18 libraries have their Interlibrary Loan personnel inform bibliographers and branch librarians of ILL transactions that might be useful for them to use in filling gaps in the collections. Some do it right across the board, a copy of all ILL borrowings is made and sent to the subject specialists who cover the areas, to take action or not, as he/she sees fit. Michigan's ILL Department is particularly active and conscientious in this activity. The Head of the Interlibrary Loan Department, who is also in charge of Graduate Reserve, recommends purchases if he notices holes in the collection and turns requests over to the selector in charge of that area. If he notices patterns of newspaper usage, these are considered for purchase. On individual books, he alerts selectors of titles borrowed two to three times a semester; he also passes along suggestions from students.

Wisconsin has a very successful, state-wide, interlibrary loan system called WILS. Before WILS was established, the University of Wisconsin was doing only 4,000 ILL's a year, and since WILS they have doubled the figure each year—over 100,000 ILLs transactions were processed this year. This generates a lot of good will. Libraries pay into a budget on the basis of use. The University of Wisconsin has gone to the legislature to get money for materials to fill in holes in the collection on the basis of service to the state.

MINITEX is the state-wide system to share resources in the state of Minnesota, with its headquarters located in the Wilson Library at the University of Minnesota. The University of Minnesota is essentially <u>the</u> collection for the system, suppling more than 80% of

the loans, or over 124,000 loans for last year. The Director feels that the MINITEX sharing program deserves much of the credit for a major increase in the materials budget the library secured this year. The Director could point to this sharing which reduces the necessity for building up big collections in other libraries in the state. The collection development people at the University of Minnesota definitely keep in mind what is requested for MINITEX. The libraries in the state also have the Minnesota Union List of Serials that is part of the CONSER project.

The state of Illinois has a flourishing system called ILLINET. One of the university library bibliographers at Champaign-Urbana commented that ILLINET items not available in university collections are sent to the Collection Development Officer who distributes them to departmental or subject bibliographers for action. The Geography and Map Library at the University of Illinois has been designated at the Illinois Bibliographic Center for Cartographic Materials. This library has an OCLC terminal and printer, and they are inputting all current maps and believe that they are the first academic map library to do this. They microfilmed their map catalog, which increased their ILL demand and service.

Northwestern's Transportation Library head informed me that one-third to 40% of their total service were requests from ILL. They handle these themselves, try to learn from them, and try to order if they are within the scope of the library's collection policy.

The Baker interlibrary loan system at the university library at Berkeley (special phone service for the professors and requests are mailed to them) has proved a successful in alerting them to gaps in their collections. At Stanford many of the ILL slips for borrowing

originate in the branches, so the librarians keep records for possible selection. At the Main Library ILL slips go to the Collection Development Officer for information on borrowing and possible action.

In summary, about half the libraries do feed back to the selectors information from ILL borrowings. The well-funded state-wide systems have fostered much wider borrowing within the states and have helped justify more funds for the lending libraries to fill in gaps in their collections. Everyone seems happy with this and one representative of a large Eastern library observed to me that "charging (by his library) for ILL spread the load and this is good."

MICROFORMS

In the past, there has been considerable resistance to the use of microforms for a variety of reasons, some of which are being eliminated. Slowly the libraries are getting better microforms facilities and equipment. Separate Microtext Rooms are becoming common, and in new buildings the environment for using microforms is excellent. Such libraries as Texas, Northwestern's Science-Engineering, and the Chemistry library at Michigan State are examples. Several libraries loan portable microform readers to their faculty and graduate students. Four or five libraries have special committees appointed to study which periodicals should be retained on microforms, which kept hard bound, and for what period of time. The Brittle Books Program at Berkeley has money for microfilming for preservation. One librarian felt that much of the so-called "reader resistance" was really from the librarians (I agree) and that some "continuing education" with the library staff personnel was needed. Comfortable reading areas, machines which give good, clear, legible print (such as the Micro Design 950 at Stanford's Meyer Library) will do much to attract and keep readers. When the machines are good and easy to use, users, even if hesitate at first, will find them acceptable.

Another reason for the greater familiarity by clientele with microforms, especially microfiche, is that some libraries have put their Serials Catalog, or catalog supplements, or lists of backlogs on fiche, and these must be used to find what is needed. Familiarity and successful use of microforms causes resitance to vanish. When there is no alternative, like having all The New York Times only on microfilm, as we do at Indiana, the students and faculty will use the

material, and they particularly expect to use microforms for most newspapers and many periodical backfiles. Out main problem tends to be overcrowding in the Microforms Room at paper writing time.

The kinds of materials many ARL libraries have now on microforms include: both backfiles and relatively current runs of newspapers, both major U.S. and foreign; backruns of periodicals, historical material to fill in gaps, and the heavily-used (to avoid some of the razor-blading problem); Joint Missionary Archives (London); Slave Trade microfilm; replacement of missing books; reprints of Slavic from the International Documentation Corporation in Switzerland; European statistics of the 19th Century; NTIS Reports--such as the Social and Behavioral Sciences and Engineering; University or Oregon these in psychology, education, and recreation; Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology from the American Psychology Association on fiche; rare and out-of-print books; two special Germanic collections, Harold Jantz and Faber Du Faur; SE Asia photography collection on fiche; University of Chicago text-fiche, Chadwick-Healey Art Exhibit Catalogs; special Labor Union Collection; Chemical patents; California newspapers; Garretson Collection on Women; Short Title Catalog; Shoemaker; British Sessional Papers; older Chemical Journals before 1930 on microfilm; Sadler's Spectral Data ($25,000); British Foreign Office Records publications; Archival material from Great Britain ($250,000); Census Records; Non-Depository U.S. Documents; U.S. National Archives publications; special Conference on the UN; Evans; Human Relations Area File; Energy Department publications; Organization of American States Official Records; Annual business reports on fiche and company files on microfilm; "Working Papers in Economics and Business" from Warwick University, England; Securities and Exchange Commission releases on fiche; Goldsmith-Kress Library of Economic Literature; filmed antiquarian Russian periodicals; theses from University Microfilms; dissertations

from Britain; archives on microform; Ghana history; CAMP African project; LAMP Latin American project; original manuscripts including musical; expensive reprints; fiche from Argonne Laboratories; all the available Presidential papers; Early American Periodical series; microfilm of 19th Century American books; ERIC (everyone has this); one East Asian library alone has some 4,000 reels of microfilm in its field, including archival; Latin American, Asian and Slavic newspapers; one library films its own university master's theses; Government Archives materials available on microforms like the Japanese Foreign Archives, the German Archives on the Far East, the British Public Records Office on China plus some collectanea; physics publishers are putting out fiche supplements which are being purchased; and some 21 current serials titles from the American Chemical Society. This list should give some idea of the breadth and depth of the microforms collections, while admittedly this is not an exhaustive listing of the holdings.

Many of the departmental libraries, also called branches or units, suffer from lack of proper equipment. It is no small financial problem to purchase the varied types of readers and reader printers needed for microfilm, microfiche, microcards, and microprint further complicated by different reduction ratios, and supplementary equipment is needed for housing the microforms.

A few libraries have made special provisions for servicing their microforms: Michigan State's Chemistry Library had special tables constructed for their Reader/Printers and have special carousels for microfiche holders. The Bell and Howell Foundation has furnished an impressive array of equipment to the Science-Engineering Library at Northwestern, and the Texas space, layout, and equipment is excellent, and they offer self-service to their clientele without any apparent problems.

Librarians have found it wise and necessary to work closely with the faculty when building the collection and services via microforms. If this is not done, the faculty and students can rise up with considerable wrath. I have found that only about 10 to 15 percent of titles available on microfilm will raise the hackles of the users--those publications which have special colors or line drawings, for example. If the 10 to 15 percent which must be kept on hard copy for at least a period of some years can be identified, then microforms can be used but only if the faculty and students are kept informed. Advisory Committees of some kind usually are wise to help educate their fellow users and to help explain the necessity for the microforms. Shortage of space is a major reason cited by many for going to microforms, and format, as with newspapers, is another. Backup for periodicals under heavy pressure (Playboy, Time, US News and World Report, Newsweek) are frequently purchased in microform. Believe it or not, one librarian told me that their microfilm copy of Playboy had been razor-bladed! Other materials are only available in microformat usually archival material, manuscripts and such. The problems of microforms will not go away, so we must try to solve it to the best of our ability. Encouraging progress is being made.

I compared the Total Microform Holdings in the ARL Statistics for 1975/76 to 1976/77 and found an increase (despite a large decrease for Minnesota) of 2,714,238 in 1976/77. See Table 4.

It is interesting to note that the institutions with the largest collections of hard bound volumes do not have the largest microforms collections. Of those I visited, Columbia was ranked highest at seventh on the list.

Table 4: MICROFORMS IN THE 19 ARL LIBRARIES*

Institutions	1975/76	1976/77	Increase
Harvard	1,272,351	1,501,444	228,093
Yale	931,827	992,994	61,167
Columbia	1,386,267	1,707,474	321,207
North Carolina	1,097,671	1,198,980	101,309
Minnesota	1,065,882	941,976	-123,906
Iowa	901,502	1,085,982	184,480
Wisconsin	1,246,940	1,339,646	92,706
Ohio State	1,019,047	1,145,094	126,047
Michigan	1,178,964	1,406,214	227,250
Michigan State	934,973	973,852	38,879
Purdue	809,876	874,188	64,312
Illinois	1,324,840	1,358,993	34,153
Northwestern	617,150	669,946	52,796
Chicago	531,861	572,833	40,972
Texas	1,359,212	1,621,400	262,188
UCLA	1,397,718	1,513,356	115,638
Berkeley	912,089	1,084,450	172,361
Stanford	1,231,888	1,630,598	398,710
Indiana	955,874	1,271,750	315,876
Total		22,891,470	2,714,238
Average increase			142,855 (6.24%)

*ARL statistics

AUTOMATION

Automation has both its friends and detractors, but its progress appears inevitable. One of the top administrators at an Eastern University stated: "Automation is bringing more standardization and coordination than library administrators have ever succeeded in doing. Automation is doing for books what indexes have done for periodicals." On the other hand, a Midwest Library director reportedly said he would allow "no OCLC in any way."

When asked about automation, libraries offered a varied response. A Life Sciences librarian in the Midwest commented that the computer is good for bibliography but patrons are disappointed when the library does not have the materials located, and they get more dissatisfied with the collection.

Members of one Midwestern university expressed somewhat different thoughts about automation: (1) The library administration made the decision to push for technical processing automation, and excellence innovation was achieved in technical development but not in public service or collection development. (2) The library is into the third version of the automated system now, but the staff training and elimination of bugs, etc. takes a lot of time, and automation is less flexible than the manual system. (3) One bibliographer (Area Studies) has a backlog of 17,000 uncataloged which is part of a general backlog--he does have 80,000 cataloged. (4) The automated system is a real time saver; soon as material is received it is put on the system and the information is available to anyone having a CRT, plus a temporary slip is put into the catalog. If you have MARC copy, the processing is more rapid. End of quotes from this university.

Most librarians had some thoughts on what the payment for OCLC (or BALLOTS or any other automated system) adds to the budget problems. These services do not come free, and one acquisitions head said that he had lost four positions because of automation and was short of staff. Staff members suspect that in some cases the total amount of money spent for automation is not widely publicized to the staff or faculty and is, in fact, somewhat hidden.

One large state system does not have a union shelf list and hopes to solve this major headache via automation. They do have a large budget for automation so their hope is well-founded. Their Bio-Medical Library is a leader in automation and has the following: (1) Lists of serials--a patron list and a master list--which include holdings, (2) An in-process serial list, (3) An active, used check-in system for serials, (4) A bindery list, (5) A budget statement list--they use a PDP-11 mini-computer, and they want to become as independent of the main computer as feasible.

A Bio-Medical library on the West Coast is also a leader in library automation. Their system generates order slips, daily on-line record changes, and internal print-outs on receiving. The system has a key-word plus author/title access; subject access is assigned at the time of ordering, when they divide the items into 12-15 broad subject categories. Cost, budget justification information are encoded, for they know just how much a percentage of increase there is in the costs, and the system is used for cataloging. This library has a very impressive science serials printout of information.

Another West Coast library gets a serials titles print out, print-outs of titles temporarily cataloged, a supplemental list of titles recently cataloged, and a list of titles on order and in process. One

bibliographer for this library commented, however, that "you get faster but less bibliographic information, less sits around, but you get more temporary cataloging, so bibliographical control is weakened." A third West Coast library not only uses the CRTs for searching, ordering, and cataloging, and it also uses them for claiming. The machine prints out claim notices and, if there is no results, it notifies the bibliographer who placed the original order! An older bibliographer in the social sciences was pleased with the CRT terminals and stated that you can access it in more ways than the card catalog.

Illinois is inputting maps into the automated system, and Purdue reports 90% to 95% hits on OCLC. Two librarians at another Midwest University said that OCLC is against availability because of holding books until OCLC records are available; cataloged books are coming faster. Finally at a noted Midwestern University, the Undergraduate Library staff were most pleased by their use of an automated circulation system for reserves, for they were able to save money by knowing, from circulation use studies, how many copies to order.

REFERENCE

The amount of time the subject and area librarians, the bibliographers, whose main job assignment is Collection Development, devoted to reference was investigated. Basically their reference work is at the request of graduate students and faculty. Of some 20 bibliographers I persuaded to give me percentages of their time used for reference, the time averaged out at 15% (a span of 5%-30%). Most of the reference service given by the bibliographers are to graduate students and secondly to faculty, with a little to undergraduates and community people.

The bibliographers give a variety of reference services, such as prepare bibliographies and serve as subject or area specialists, many times by referral from general reference librarians or other library staff. They also help students find subjects to write papers on and also help these students with the bibliography. They work with graduate students to find subjects for theses or dissertations, which may involve special acquisitions projects, locating material for them, and getting items on ILL, etc. Other clients may be architects who are building new universities in foreign countries or export-import businesses that need to know facts such as annual rainfall, etc. Faculty members and graduate students go the bibliographers as a result of the latter's liaison work with the academic departments. Those bibliographers whose offices are in or near the stacks may get a great number of general references questions. They also prepare exhibits or bibliographic guides. A few volunteer to work on the Information Desk, and others are assigned to the Reference Desk from two to eight hours a week. This assignment to general reference work does not make most of them happy as they

regard themselves, quite rightly, as in-depth specialists in one or several subject areas--but not in all. They feel a bit inadequate in trying to cover the whole range of general reference.

Some libraries have special service organizations that the bibliographers participate in. A West Coast library has a "Graduate Bibliographic Service" as part of the Reference Department. Students and faculty make appointments with the library specialists (at Indiana they are "Reference Raps"). The same West Coast library has a "Cooperative Services Office" and if the regular service, which includes processing faculty telephone requests and mailing material to them, cannot satisfy the request, the faculty are referred to the Collection Development Office. The same library also runs Faculty Bibliographic Seminars which are on introduction to the general structure of the library, bibliographic resources, new catalogs in the library, and the organization of the card catalogs including special catalogs for subject areas, documents and ethnic studies, and such.

How much advanced and specialized reference work is done by the bibliographers, curators, or selectors, depends a lot on their physical location. If they are hidden away in the labyrinth of an older research library, they may be almost impossible to find except by the most determined students or faculty. This is the case in many libraries. If, on the other hand, as in most new libraries they are in offices near their major collections, they are consulted much frequently and spend a larger portion of their time on reference work.

Attitudes of the bibliographers themselves or of the library administration also have effect on the amount of reference service. Some subject or area librarians look upon themselves as "collection builders" first, last, and always, and they actually seem to resent time

taken away from this part of their job. If the library administration expects them to do reference or liaison work, as well as collection building, and if the administration enforces this requirement through evaluations, the bibliographers will tend to do a better job in making their reference services known and will give better service. If on the other hand, the administration is really only interested in building the collection (this situation is mostly past history now), the bibliographers do not emphasize reference work.

Another variation on the topic of reference occurs where the curator or bibliographer is also the administrator of a Reading Room. Then the specialist is partially an administrator. He/she will do much of the reference work of any complexity, or a professional assistant will help under his/her supervision, and he/she may also have to supervise both technical and public service for this reading room. These job requirements are most prevalent when vernacular languages require the administrator to be a language expert, as in the Far East, Middle East, Slavic, Latin American and African areas, with some also in South and Southeast Asia, and a few for Afro-American or Black Studies.

Another special service given by some bibliographers is covered in this report under "Teaching."

TEACHING

I have long been curious as to how many bibliographers were actually teaching for-credit courses, and I do not mean "how to use the library" type. Following is an incomplete list, I'm sure, but it provides some idea of the subjects taught.

Table 5. COURSES TAUGHT BY BIBLIOGRAPHERS

Institution	Bibliographer	Course Title
Harvard	Raymond Lum	Bibliography course on East Asia and Southeast Asia
Wisconsin	Jack Wells	Bibliography of South Asia
Michigan	Wayne Wan	General bibliography required for MA in Far East Advanced course in bibliography
Indiana	Shizue Matsuda	Japanese bibliography
Berkeley	Richard Cooper	Primary Sources for Arabic Studies--Historiography Bibliography for Students of Arabic
Wisconsin	David Henige	Historical Methods
Ohio State	Marsha McClintock	Arabic bibliography
Michigan State	Gene DeBenko	The bibliography of Africa
Indiana	Jean Gosebrink	Bibliography of Africa South of the Sahara
UCLA	Ludwig Lauerhass, Jr.	General Introduction to Latin American Bibliography
Stanford	James Breedlove	Latin American Bibliography
Stanford	Wojciech Zalewski	Introduction to Slavic Bibliography
Indiana	Andrew Turchyn	Soviet and East European Library Materials
Minnesota	Judith Overmier	History of Medicine Bibliography
UCLA	Louise Darling	Health and Life Science Libraries Bibliography of Health and Life Sciences

Table 5. Continued

Institution	Bibliographer	Course Title
Berkeley	Rita Kane	Health Sciences Bibliography
Columbia	Tom Watkins	Music Bibliography
Indiana	David Fenske	Introduction to Music Bibliography
Michigan	Maurita Holland	Information Research
Michigan State	Beth Shapiro	Bibliographic Methods in Social Science Research
Purdue	Edwin Posey	Nuclear Engineering Bibliography
Illinois	Michael Gorman	Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services
Chicago	Robert Wadsworth	Enumerative Bibliography
UCLA	Tom Fry	Bibliography
Stanford	Alexander Ross	Proseminar in Art Historical Bibliography and Library Methods
Indiana	Barbara Halporn	Bibliography of Classics
Indiana	Gary Wiggins	Chemical Documentation Research in Chemical Documentation

TECHNICAL SERVICES INVOLVEMENT

Librarians who are responsible for collection development do get involved with Technical Services departments. Area specialists, or Curators, who deal with exotic languages--Chinese, Japanese, Slavic, South and East Asian, African, Arabic, Hebrew,--often either supervise the acquisitions and cataloging of their materials, or actually do some or all of the cataloging. They also may suggest dealers to be used in procuring materials, and they may assign priorities for handling or cataloging the volumes. One selector works half the time as the Head of a Cataloging Unit in the Catalog Department. Another is the Head of the Catalog Department and does Slavic selection as an additional duty. Still another bibliographer does the serials claiming and follow-up. Many do much of the required searching or at least supervise it.

On the other hand, Acquisitions people may do most or all of the searching for the bibliographers, and this can be a point of friction when decisions are made on priorities of tasks within a technical services department without consulting the bibliographer about what is to be searched first of his/her catalogs and lists. It can and does lead to some stimulating differences of opinion. This reminds me of a comment made by a Reference Department librarian in the Midwest who noted the "productive tension struggle for scarce resources between Technical Services and Public Services." A Physical Science Library Coordinator philosophically stated that he had "learned to live with Technical Services" except that the cataloging of serials which takes 16-18 months was making him a trifle restless!

Branches or departmental libraries are usually different from bibliographers when it comes to technical services problems. Many

branch and departmental have their own technical processing as well as being responsible for the collection building. This is especially true of music, art, maps, some science libraries, slide collections (usually part of the Art collection), special collections such as rare books, transportation, and government publications. This does take time away from their collection building, but then they seem rather tolerant of how they solve their own processing problems!

PRESERVATION

Most libraries are just getting started on their preservation programs. For example, the four RLG libraries (Harvard, Yale, New York Public, and Columbia) each received $15,000 for preservation, and they are making a list of candidates for preservation. There is a Preservation Officer at Yale who reports to the Public Services director. The subject librarians decide if they are to replace deteriorated materials and in what format. These materials are brought to the subject librarians, often by the Circulation Department personnel, for there is no systematic search through the stacks searching for such problems.

At Northwestern there is a Standing Committee on Preservation and Security of Library Materials, organized on October 11, 1977, and the library is paying for a student to learn to be a conservator. At Chicago the Collection Development Committee has a Sub-Committee on the Preservation of Library Materials, and funds have been allocated for preservation, mostly for replacement of ailing books. At UCLA there is a "Serials Microform Review Committee" for possible use of film instead of binding, for reasons of both space and preservation. At UCLA they are "easing into this problem area." They now use film for preservation. They have a photographic collection and have received a grant for copying or filming unique materials. Berkeley has its Brittle Books program which has $8,000 a year to be used for microfilming for preservation. Indiana has employed a preservation librarian on an hourly basis.

Other than the Library of Congress, probably Stanford has done the most planning in this area. Dr. Mosher presented me with a copy

of an impressive report, "The Conservation and Preservation Program for the University Libraries at Stanford." The Administrative Services Director, who is the Budget Officer for the library, informed me that they will have a full-time person for conservation officer and that they plan to add technicians to expand their efforts, locally and regionally, and even nationally. Dr. Mosher's report outlines the current circumstances in the Stanford libraries as well as summarizing the national efforts to date, then gives the "guiding principles for a program redefinition, the objectives for Stanford action, a profile of a Conservation Officer in the Stanford University Libraries, the "Action Components and Timing from the fall of 1977 to 1982," and adds as Appendix I--The Preservation Department Annual Report 1974/75 of the Columbia University Libraries, Library Support Group, which outlines what it would cost to really do the job for Columbia in 1974/75--a little over $34 million dollars. Appendix II is "Recent and Current Efforts of the Stanford Libraries on Conservation and Preservation of Materials."

Also in the ALA RTSD-RS Collection Development Committee's "Guidelines for Review of Library Collections for Relegation, Preservation or Discard," there is a section 2.2.7 on "Deteriorating Materials Criteria", and Dr. Mosher has been one of the moving spirits in this effort. The Barrow Laboratory, the Library of Congress, and Paul Mosher at Stanford are foremost authorities on preservation programs for libraries.

EVALUATION OF COLLECTIONS

Two of the universities have done significant work on evaluations of collections--Texas and Stanford. Carolyn Bucknall of Texas gave me a copy of their "Measurement of Collections," an 11-paged summary of a survey of all their library subject fields. Each reported on "evaluations of holdings in last ten years; bibliographies used" and also on "results", "increased funds?", and "further suggestions." Of 50 subject areas reporting, 22 had done evaluations of various extents and depths.

Paul Mosher, Assistant Director for Collection Development at Stanford, is, to my knowledge the most active of librarians in this field. On June 15, 1977, he delivered a paper to the ALA RTSD-RS Collection Development Preconference, titled "Collection Evaluation: the Search for Quality, Consistency, and System in Collection Development." In this excellent paper he gives a "brief overview of the history and progress of the art of Collection Evaluation in American libraries, then deals with some common problems of recent scholarship and practice--particularly the issues of quality vs. quantity, subjective vs. objective, and the degree to which collection evaluation can be considered an art or a science at this stage of its development, and finally to describe the theory and practice of some recent methodology." (from page 2) Dr. Mosher has also been practicing what he preaches, for Stanford has an active evaluation program in action and one or more evaluations were completed in 18 different subject fields by November 21, 1977, while others are still in progress.

In a paper dated Sept. 16, 1977, titled "The Collection Evaluation Program," Dr. Mosher summarizes what the evaluations are intended to do:

1) "to provide us with means for our bibliographers to learn and to know better their portions of the multi-million volume research collections, 2) to establish useful bases for the revision of Stanford's Collection Development Statement, 3) to provide data for us to use in coordinating some aspects of our selection process with the University of California at Berkeley, 4) to provide information on which to build deliberate and shaped plans and specific recommendations for the enlargement and improvement of our library collections, and to do so in the most useful and efficient way, and with the greatest economy, 5) to add support to our book budget requests, 6) to make possible the most productive expenditure of library resources."

Dr. Mosher also gave me a copy of their Graduate Student Bibliographers' Manual Draft II, 1 November, 1977, on the subject of "The Collection Evaluation Program." This covers the intricacies of the Card Catalog, Serials Records and Searching, plus Government Documents. This is a very useful, practical, 37-paged document which answers most questions students would have in working on such a project. Perhaps here is the place to state publically that I feel that Dr. Mosher is one of the most energetic and progressive Collection Development members, and I am confident that the ARL community will continue to benefit from his wisdom and drive.

USE STUDIES

In half of the 18 libraries visited, various kinds of use studies have been made, some more intensive than others, and with varying purposes. Many libraries were planning to do use studies and were lamenting the lack of automated circulation systems which might give them more valid results than were possible to date. One library has an automated circulation system,but programming is needed to get information for collection development and for cancellations, discarding, or movement of materials to storage. They wish to pinpoint not only non-use but also which titles to duplicate because of heavy use, and even to ascertain the cost of retrieving books from storage. This programming is being financed from local research funds.

Undergraduate libraries seem to be the most interested and active in studying use, since they feel they must keep current, and they are heavily invested in Reserves and are trying to keep on reserve only those actively used. Several undergraduate libraries do have automated circulation systems and have allocated funds for collection development based on a percentage of circulation statistics. Almost every library keeps tabs on Reserves circulation, most of which are still manually operated.

Science branches have been quite active in use studies, particularly use studies of serials. One excellent example is reported on C and R Libraries for Nov. 1976, by Maurita P. Holland, titled "Serial Cuts vs Public Service: a formula." This is a study at the Engineering-Transportation Library, University of Michigan, of some 1,200 current unbound titles and some 1,600 bound titles. Under a sub-title of "Little-Used Material" she comments that of the gift (free) titles, 102 of 193

received zero use. Foreign titles accounted for 10% of the budget but 1.5% of the use, and translation titles required 22% of the budget and received 1.6% of the use. On the other hand, 50% of the unbound journals used can be supplied by 25 titles or .7% of the budget. Of the bound titles, 10% of the titles supplied 80% of user needs.

Two Purdue studies of use are of interest. One is by Miriam A. Drake and Joan Kulm on library loans and circulation in the School of Engineering Library. Another publication, in which a study of use is included, is by Theodora Andrew of the Purdue Pharmacy Library. Robert Goehlert of Indiana University has recently published an article about journal use, "Periodical Use in an Academic Library, a Study of Economists and Political Scientists," in Special Libraries, February, 1978. Dave Cobb of the Geography and Map Library at Illinois did an exhaustive study for a year of the use of maps, who used them, and for what reasons. He then used this information to make collection development decisions and also to decide the level of staffing in the library at different times.

Chemistry libraries at Chicago, Stanford, and Illinois have either done use studies or are in the process. Math and Biology Libraries are actively interested in use studies. The Physics-Math-Astronomy Library at Michigan did a study of use of serials between gift or exchange journals and the paid-for journals and found that only 35% of the unused ones were paid, 55% of the exchanges were not used, and 65% of the gifts were unused. A very successful gifts and exchange program here made cutting the serials budget most difficult. Michigan's Japanese-Chinese collection does a circulation use study every couple of years by analyzing the Library of Congress Classification to get a rough idea of use, and they also study the ILL records to see what is coming and going.

Michigan State has used spot inventories of heavily-used areas to pinpoint what needs to be replaced from those missing and where use requires duplication. The Math/Statistics Library at Michigan State also did a year's study of use for possible serials cutting and was impressed by the tremendous interdisciplinary use of the collection. One librarian commented that priorities at her university had changed from collection development to service and this has sparked her interest in use studies. To some extent, I feel this is true of most of the libraries: the former generation of Directors emphasized collection building while the current group is much more service oriented and, frankly, more adaptable.

The spectre of serials cancellations seems yet to hang over almost every librarian I talked to and most were very concerned to be able to pinpoint those of least use. I was surprised to learn how many libraries still used either date due slips or had book cards in the books, so it was possible to ascertain how many years it had been since a volume circulated. This information was used most frequently in transfers of volumes to storage. Combining inventory with a study of use has been done in several libraries, again mostly to pinpoint what goes to a storage collection. The main problem in getting user information is plain lack of staff time to do the work. Almost everyone sees the need; the question is, what is possible and what are the priorities? Automated circulation systems seem to be the main hope for getting "the facts, ma'am!"

Another very recent use study is dated February 1, 1978, by Martha J. Bailey, Physics Library, Purdue University, titled "Selecting Materials for Interdisciplinary Programs."

WEEDING AND STORAGE

In these 19 large ARL research libraries, weeding has been minimally done. Some weeding has been done in these categories: poor physical condition, lack of use over a period of years, out-of-date, out-of-scope, duplicates, "trash," juvenile books, uncataloged pool of materials, PL-480 receipts, Middle East books from blanket orders, science books unneeded when moving, state and local documents (15,000 in one case), scattered runs of serials, and Defense Department documents.

Actually what most librarians brought up to me when I asked about discards turned out to be "discarding" to storage! Selection of volumes to be moved to various types of storage is an on-going concern at a number of libraries, simply because of lack of space in the Main Library and the branches. As a West Coast Collection Development Officer said to me: "Weeding is either bottom or top priority; you do it only when desperate." This appears to be an accurate reading of the situation in ARL libraries.

Storage libraries usually hold basically non-circulating volumes; "not circulated" usually means from one to 10 years. The storage libraries may also hold unprocessed items which have been only brief-listed and may NEVER be fully processed. At an Eastern library they have a "Boxing and Discard Committee" to decide which titles that they do not now have space for are to be boxed for a new building. The last copy, if it is to be discarded, has to have the approval of this committee.

Dr. Paul Mosher, Stanford, gave me a copy of a draft for RTSD-RS, Collection Development Committee, titled "Guidelines for Review of Library Collections for Relegation, Preservation or Discard ("Weeding")," which

was discussed at Midwinter ALA, January 1978. Anyone seriously interested in either relegation (relocation?) to storage or in discarding should review this guideline.

ELITISM vs. NO ONE CARES

There is a very definite split in over half the libraries regarding whether or not the bibliographers and curators are an "elitist" group. (There is NO WAY I am going to specify individual universities here; but what I report is as exact as I can make it.)

To some extent at least, the attitude toward bibliographers and curators is negative from some branch librarians, reference and acquisition staff members--not all, of course. The following are summaries of conversations: (From a bibliographer) Bibliographers are free-wheeling so there may be some envy of the advantages of the job. Most bibliographers have faculty status and tenure (at this one university) while most branch librarians do not and this is a major irritant. There is a question of service dedication with the international bibliographers around only half a day and their clerks trained in only the technical aspects of the job. Acquisitions people do feel that the bibliographers are elitist while the bibliographers feel the acquisitions personnel are totally uncooperative, so there are always little brush fires to be put out, and the location of the bibliographers in the acquisitions area does not help. Also, acquisitions searchers are to do only the searching that leads up to ordering, so the issue becomes a question of priorities and not being able to get some checked on speculation that they might be ordered. The staff wonders what the bibliographers spend their time on; as they do not have public responsibility, they have an easier situation. They are viewed as not doing anyting, not visible, which causes "bad feeling" on the staff. One branch librarian feels bibliographers are lazy, do not work bad hours, have lots of privileges, are overpaid, and do not have added responsibilities. One branch librarian, while not complaining

of bibliographers per se, commented that she had to do selection in five subject areas, had personnel problems, plus reference services and had no approval plans or blanket orders! In another university the elitism is felt in the Acquisitions Department because their non-professional level searchers are not rated as highly as searchers for the Curators, and the latter feel they are higher class.

The comments continue: Curators travel abroad, are more visible; bibliographers and curators have softer jobs, do not have as much committee work. Curators have two full-time clericals working for them, who could actually run the shop, in fact one did one year while the curator was on sabbatical. The predecessor of the present Collection Development Head told the staff they they were elitist and a hand-picked group and they do report directly to the Collection Development Head, while others report to another supervisor, like Reference. Bibliographers represent the faculty and want to add one copy of research materials while other staff members want to add duplicates to meet the demands of the graduate students, a situation which causes conflict.

Bibliographers have their own gripes and concerns, also having considerable validity, such as: No one knows if bibliographers are doing a good job. There is no administrative control to force adherence to policy statements; one bibliographer has only general guidelines; there is no control of how much each person spends, and no one knows what the bibliographer is doing, although everyone has speculations. Another wonders why she does not report to the Collection Development Officer. People have no place to turn to. Bibliographers feel they need someone to pay them attention and to do evaluations which have not been done. There is real conflict between reference and bibliographers. Physical isolation is a problem; curators are near Collection Development Officer's Office, so he gives them more work to do plus three out of four teach in

their areas (this comment by a Branch Librarian!). There is general unhappiness when forced to work on the general reference desk, since most bibliographers are not trained across all fields to handle this kind of a job which takes different training. Some bibliographers, however, volunteer to work on the Information Desk and said that they enjoyed the opportunity for this varied responsibility (I do think these are the exception). They do it because they want to, so the motivation is there.

There is a problem here of communication more than anything else. I have never met a bibliographer or curator who did not feel that he/she was not busy at least 100% of their time, and I know some do put in more hours than required and the assignments of some are, on the face of it, impossible to fulfill, such as the gentleman with his 21 subjects. But the Branch Librarians, the Acquisitions and Reference Department personnel, in some instances at least, are not at all convinced of this and feel the bibliographers have it easier, with fewer assignments, more control of their time, can travel, and are better paid plus in some cases have better status or more prestige. Where possible, the groups should meet together to make each other better understand the problems each faces and explain where the time is spent and what is required of the job, such as advanced degrees, liaison work, advanced reference, teaching, budget hassels, etc. On the other hand, library administrators should make sure the organization of the staff gives the bibliographers someone logical to report to, who appreciates their problems and will battle for, and appreciate, them. After all, they want to be loved, too!

SPACE AND STAFF PROBLEMS
(Priority of Needs)

Space problems were mentioned as the first priority of needs by nine of the 18 ARL libraries, and this same problem was rated second in importance by six additional libraries. On the other hand, seven libraries said staff (personnel) was their first priority need, and staff was the second most important need in two other institutions. In fact no one said they had enough staff to give the kind of service they would like. The third priority need was for more funds for materials, and the fourth was for equipment, such as microform readers, reader/printers, etc.

These cold mathematical figures emphasize priority only but give no idea of the depth of need. In 15 systems there is a strong need for more space, especially in the branches. In eight I believe there is also definite need for more space in the Main Library. There is even one which really does not even have a Main Library! They are tenants in a large building.

In many cases the branches started up as departmental collections and ultimately were taken into the main library system, but they had been competing with laboratories, faculty offices, and classrooms and were not able to secure adequate space. In most systems, the academic departments still control the space, and the Main Library, which has been busy building research collections, has not been able to exert enough pressure to solve all the space problems in the outlying branches. In the typical ARL library I visited there were a minority of relatively new and adequate branch libraries, show places, but there were at least half that many suffering acute pangs from lack of space. At one Midwestern University I was told that only two or three branches out of 16 have space for more materials. One branch, on the West Coast, a former University President's

home, stands out in my mind for being incredibly crowded and old and inappropriate building for library use.

There was much talk of storage libraries and of sorting out material to move to them, or of hopes for construction of a new storage facility. This was true on both the East Coast and West Coast as well as the Midwest. Microforms certainly have not solved the space problem, and I doubt very much that automation will either.

Staff shortages are much in the thoughts of at least half the library administrators. The Director of one Big Ten library flatly stated "we are 50% understaffed." Another said that the library had been cut $180,000 for personnel this past year, and to compensate the bibliographers were assigned for a full day each week to the general reference desk.

One Midwestern library has a grand total of one full-time equivalent clerical assistant for all their bibliographers and curators. In the West one Collection Development Chief told me, "Lack of people is the big problem," and that system has at least four branches run by nonprofessionals. In one library, A Humanities bibliographer and a Social Science bibliographer have no clerical or student assistance; in another, a Social Sciences bibliographer assures me that he is supposed to handle 21 subject fields! In several of our biggest libraries there is one Humanities bibliographer and one Social Sciences bibliographer, and one library has a total of one bibliographer.

The selectors do the best they can, but I sense a feeling of almost desperation, of the frustration of never being able to feel the job is being done the way it should be. One top Collection Development Officer in the country said, "We do not have enough help, some administrators do not have a concept of what goes into a bibliographer's job--too many

bibliographer's is the attitude." A Middle East Bibliographer said that any searching he gets done he has to do himself; he has no time to develop want lists, and service on committees and special studies take a lot of time from his regular job. A Branch librarian stated that he puts in 55-60 hours a week and has not time for himself because of the demands of reference, administration, as well as the collection development duties. An Acquisitions Department Head commented he had lost four people because of automation and sure could use more help.

A Midwest Library Director lamented that it was hard to get personnel in the budget, which is a continuing commitment, while it is easier to get materials funds--a one year commitment. One staff member felt that staff were exploited to the maximum; another said that he had to work nights on his own time to get his two-sided job accomplished.

These are only a few examples of the opinions I heard regarding personnel. Many libraries have not had staff additions for years, or have been cut back appreciably at a time when demands have increased and in some cases additional funds have been made available to purchase materials with no additional personnel to do the processing or service work. Therefore, both space and personnel needs are considered quite serious in over half the libraries I visited. Equipment needs are also of serious concern.